

## ARTICLE V.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS IN THE REVISED  
VERSION.

BY REV. R. D. C. ROBBINS, NEWTON HIGHLANDS.

THE objection that has been oftenest made and dwelt upon by those who have criticised the Revised Version of the New Testament — the *numerous* changes, many of them small and unimportant, if not absolutely inferior to the readings of the Authorized Version — applies in full force, perhaps, to the Epistle to the Romans. We had supposed that the main variations from the Authorized Version were to be in those passages where the labors of the biblical scholars in the collocation of the best *ms.* in the hands of king James's translators with those since discovered have established an improved text, and where these translators had failed in giving the full and accurate meaning of the Greek original, and where words were used that have become obsolete, or are offensive to the culture of the present age.

We think we were warranted in this supposition by the language of the Convocation of Canterbury, who first originated the idea of a revision, used on the third and fifth days of May 1870. They say, "We do not contemplate any new translation of the Bible, or any alteration of the language, *except* where in the judgment of the most competent scholars *such change is necessary.*" In "the Principles and Rules agreed to by the Committee of Convocation" on the twenty-fifth day of the same month, the first rule is, "To introduce as *few* alterations as possible into the text of the Authorized Version *consistently with faithfulness.*"<sup>1</sup> Have these rules been faithfully adhered to? The following brief discussion of some words and passages may serve as a partial answer

<sup>1</sup> The italics are mine in both quotations.

to this question, as far as the Epistle to the Romans is concerned.

It cannot be denied, however, that the Revised is, in a large number of passages, a great improvement upon the Old Version; and the bringing into notice some of these excellencies has been the pleasantest part of the labor in the preparation of the present Article.

#### THE DEFINITE ARTICLE.

The revisers of the New Testament have doubtless done a good work in a careful rendering of the Greek article; but it can scarcely be denied that a too rigid adherence to literalism has sometimes led them into a defective or erroneous translation. So in ii. 12-14, "For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned under law shall be judged by law; for not the hearers of a law are just before God, but the doers of a law shall be justified: for when Gentiles which have no law, do by nature the things of the law, these, having no law, are a law unto themselves."

It must be acknowledged; in general, that νόμος (law), like other words of general import, is used in a specific sense without the article. So sometimes in classical Greek of a particular law, and often in the Apocrypha of the Mosaic law.<sup>1</sup> In this passage even ἀνόμος, vs. 12, doubtless refers to the Mosaic law, and would, at variance with both the old and new version, be properly rendered into English by "without *the* law." Compare ἄνομος in 1 Cor. ix. 21, where the reference to the Gentiles as not under the Mosaic law is plain. In the last clause, "under law" and "by law" should be "under the law" and "by the law." So in vs. 13 "hearers of *the* law" and "doers of *the* law" must be correct, unless we are prepared to believe that the doers of any law, whether just or unjust, shall be accounted righteous. Paul would seem to contradict himself in verse 14 of the

<sup>1</sup> See Winer's Greek Idioms, § 18, p. 106, and Greek of New Test., p. 117, Eng. translation, p. 152.

Revised Version; for he says, "Gentiles which have *no* law," and "having *no* law," are a *law* unto themselves. Do they not have a law, inasmuch as they themselves are a law to themselves? The rendering of Alford, with whom De Wette and Meyer substantially agree, seems to be the correct one here: "When *the* Gentiles (*ἔθνη*, without the article, as often, being sufficiently definite in itself), not having the law, do by nature the things of the law, they are the law to themselves, since they show forth the work of the law," etc. If, too, the rendering here were, "who have *no* law," we should rather expect, instead of *μή*, the absolute negative *οὐ*(*κ*); as in iv. 15, *οὐδέ οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος*, "where there is *no* law," referring to the time-preceding the giving of the law.<sup>1</sup> So plain is it in vii. 8, 9 that only the Mosaic law is referred to, that *νόμος* is rendered "*the* law" in the text, and *or law* is unnecessarily added in the margin; though it is not done in iii. 21, *χωρὶς νόμου*, "apart from *the* law."

In xiii. 8, 10, the marginal readings, "He that loveth the other hath fulfilled *law*," and "Love is the fulfilment of *law*," seem at least to be truisms which have no kind of connection with the reasoning of the context.

It is questionable whether there is not some inappositeness, if not inconsistency, in the use and omission of the article with *δικαιοσύνη*<sup>2</sup> (righteousness). In i. 17 the noun is rendered with the indefinite article, "For therein is revealed *a* righteousness of God," etc. The righteousness here designated is that which has God as its author and bestower (*Θεοῦ*, Gen. of source or origin). It does not seem to be the object of the apostle to designate by the word itself a particular kind of God's righteousness, as if that were divided up, and this was a particular species of it, but *God's righteousness*, or *the* righteousness of God, which becomes man's by faith. It is noticeable, that in the preceding verse *δύναμις Θεοῦ* is rendered "*the* power of God."

<sup>1</sup> The American revisers prefer *the law* in vs. 13; and *that have not the* for *which have no*, and *not having the* for *having no* in vs. 14.

<sup>2</sup> See Winer's Idioms, p. 123, where *δικαιοσύνη* is referred to as one of the abstract nouns with which the article is omitted.

In iii. 5 we have Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνη, "the righteousness of God"; in 21, δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, "a righteousness of God"; in 22, "the righteousness of God." Again, in iv. 13 and ix. 30 we have *the* supplied where it is difficult to see entirely *satisfactory* reasons which would not apply in cases where *a* is used.

In i. 18 ὀργή Θεοῦ is rendered "the wrath of God," but *a* wrath in the margin. It might well have been rendered "God's wrath," avoiding the use of the article. In xiii. 4, either "God's minister," or "the minister of God," is better than "*a* minister of God" in two clauses of the verse.

The revisers seem almost afraid to render the definite article by the possessive pronoun. Still, in some cases they have happily done it: as in iv. 9; v. 2; vi. 5; xv. 2, τῶ πλησίον; xi. 20 τῇ ἀπίστια, "their unbelief"; τῇ πίστει, "thy faith." In ii. 18; xii. 6 they use the pronoun, but seem to feel it necessary to put the article in the margin, though the American Committee object, in xii. 6. In vi. 4 τὸν θάνατον might well be rendered *his death*; and so in other passages, as vii. 1-3; viii. 10.; xiii. 5; xv. 2, τὸ ἀγαθόν; and so elsewhere.

There are several passages where the article is supplied in the old, but well enough omitted in the new version; e.g. vi. 15; viii. 14, "sons of God"; viii. 16, "children of God." There is great improvement in the Revised Version in the rendering of the article in v. 15 sq.<sup>1</sup>

#### PREPOSITIONS.

The revisers have frequently changed the rendering of prepositions, often well, but sometimes, as far as can readily be seen, without necessity or material advantage.

*Through*, as a rule, is substituted for *by* of the Authorized Version; as in i. 5; iii. 20, 22; v. 5, 10, 11, 17, 21; vi. 4; vii. 4, 5, 7, 11, 13. Still, *by* is occasionally well enough retained, as in i. 2; iii. 27 (*bis*); x. 17; xv. 30; and it is not easy to see why it might not also have been retained, or *by*

<sup>1</sup> See Bib. Sac., Jan. 1882, where the rendering of the Article in the Revised Version is so well and fully discussed by Professor Tyler, as to render further comment here unnecessary.

(means of) substituted, in such passages as v. 16, 17, 18, 19; vi. 4, et al. We have a discriminating rendering of *διά* with the Gen. in ii. 27, *διὰ γράμματος*, *with*, i.e. "in the possession of," or "in the light of." In ii. 24 *διά* with the Acc. is better rendered by *because of* (i.e. "on account of your wicked conduct," N. V.) than *through* (O. V.); so in iii. 25.

The rendering of the preposition *ἐν* is often better in the new than in the old version, e.g. in vi. 11, 23; xv. 13. In xv. 17 *in* is better than *through*; than *with* in i. 9; xv. 32; than *against* in ii. 5; than *of* in ii. 23; than *by* in xiv. 14; than *unto* in v. 21; than *at*, i. 15; also *for* is better than *into*, i. 23, 25; *under* than *in* in ii. 12; *by* than *in* (*ἐν τῷ αἵματι*), iii. 25. In viii. 15, *ἐν ᾧ* does not seem to us to be well rendered *whereby* (both versions), but *in whom* (the preposition used as in viii. 9; ii. 29 *ἐν πνεύματι*) as "an indwelling pervading power" (Alford), or as "in the element that moves our inner life" (Meyer). In xii. 7, 8 the change in supplying the ellipsis renders the change of the rendering of *ἐν* from *on* to *to* necessary. The rendering of the instrumental dative is often well changed from *through* to *by*, as in viii. 13; xi. 11.

In x. 21 *πρός* is plainly *as to*, or *in regard*, and not *to*, as in the old version, and might be rendered *of*. In ix. 22, 23 the preposition *εἰς* before *ἀπώλειαν* (destruction) and *δόξαν* (glory) would better be rendered *for* than *unto* (*to*), found in both versions.

#### THE RELATIVE PRONOUN.

In the use of the relative pronouns we find in the new version an inconsistency and inappropriateness which is quite unaccountable. The merest schoolboy knows that *which* refers to things and *who* to persons; and yet *which* is sometimes retained in the new version when referring distinctly to persons. It is well changed in a few cases, as i. 8; xvi. 1; and why it was not also changed in ii. 28, 29; v. 5; viii. 23; ix. 6, 25 (last clause); xvi. 12, and elsewhere it is difficult to see. In ii. 3 *man who* is better than *man that*, and in i. 15 *you who* is better than *you that*. See also ix. 16;

xiv. 14. Why it was *necessary* to change *who* to *that* in such passages as ii. 7, and *that* to *which* in vii. 19, does not seem plain. But that *those who* would be better than *them* or *they that* or *which*, and *he who* better than *he that*, in many passages, is certain, though not absolutely demanded (See ii. 8, 19; v. 14; viii. 1, 5, 28 (*bis*); x. 20 (*bis*); xii. 15 (*bis*); xiii. 2; xvi. 17).

#### THE VERB.

The forms of the verb seem to have been carefully considered by the revisers; but occasionally general rules have been so rigidly followed as to call forth much and sometimes, perhaps, merited criticism. The change of Subjunctive to Indicative forms of the verb is well done in many cases, e.g. i. 7; iv. 2, 17; viii. 9, 10, 11; xi. 15, 16; xiv. 15, and often elsewhere. A similar change might have been made in other passages, as *be* to *art* in ii. 25, and *be* to *are* in iii. 8, etc.

Chap. xi. 17 is an example of a careful rendering of the forms of the verb.

#### OLD VERSION.

If some of the branches *be* broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree *wert* grafted in among them and with them *parto* *best* etc.

#### NEW VERSION.

If some of the branches *were* broken off, and thou being a wild olive tree *wast* grafted in among them, and *didst* become *partaker* etc.

See also xv. 8, 12.

The general adherence in the new version to the indefinite Past, in the rendering of the Greek Aorist, is noticeable (See i. 2, 5; iii. 25; v. 15 (*bis*); vi. 2, 4, 6, 8, 17; vii. 4, 13; viii. 8, 15 (*bis*), 20, 36; ix. 13, 17, 20, 23, 24, 30, 31; x. 3, 16, 18, 21; xi. 1, 2, 7, 8, 11, 17; xii. 3, 6; xv. 15, 18, et al. Still there are some rather notable exceptions; as in ii. 12<sup>1</sup>; iii. 23; v. 11; xi. 34, 35. In v. 14 the Past, ἀμαρτήσαντας, might have been rendered literally *sinned*, instead of *had sinned*. There are also a few passages where the verb seems to be rather carelessly translated; as in iv. 21, ἐπήγγελται . . . ἐστιν, *had promised* and *was*, instead of *has promised*

<sup>1</sup> The American revisers here put *sinned* in the margin.

and *is*, etc. In viii. 34 the Pres. Part. *is* is rendered as Fut. though not by the American committee; and in xiii. 1, the Perf. *τεταγμένα* . . . *εἶσιν*, as Pres. instead of Perf.

In a few cases the translation of the Aorist is properly varied; as in ix. 19, *ἀνθέστηκεν* *is*, according to usage, rendered as a Present Tense, *resisteth* (withstandeth), and not *hath resisted*, as in the old version. The Aorist Past, too, from its connection with the following verb, is best rendered by the usual Perfect form; as in vi. 7, where *ἀποθανόν*, *hath died*, representing, as usual, action preceding the verb with which it is connected; here the Perfect, *δεδικαιώται*, which, as denoting an action continuing in the present, is rendered "is justified." So *ἀποθανόντες*, *having died*, in vii. 6. The signification of the Perfect (*hath been made*) is well substituted for the indefinite Past (*was*) of the old version, to translate the Perfect *γεγενησθαι*; and for the Present in v. 2, *ἔσχκαμεν*, *have had*, not *have*.

We have, also, in xv. 15 an epistolary use of the Aorist which is very properly<sup>1</sup> rendered as Present (*I write*, N. V.), though the Perfect (*have written*, O. V.) would be quite as appropriate from the stand-point of the writer in closing his Epistle. In Latin we have both Perfect *scripsi* and Imperfect *scribebam* used in the same way. In xvi. 22 the Past *ὁ γράψας* would seem to be better rendered *have written* than either *wrote* (O. V.) or *write* (N. V.).

#### THE GREEK TEXT.

The authentic text is probably as well adhered to by the revisers as could easily be done; although other scholars will doubtless sometimes differ from them, both in respect to the comparative value of different MSS., and in the discrimination used in collating them. In vi. 1 they have retained the old reading, *ἐπιμενούμεν* (shall we, etc.), whilst the best authorities seem to prefer *ἐπιμένωμεν* (may we, etc.), In ix. 9 they render "a word," etc., whilst the best MSS. seem to

<sup>1</sup> See Winer's Idioms.

retain the definite article  $\delta$ . In iv. 19 there is much difference of opinion in reference to the omission or retention of *not, ov*. Several of the best MSS. discard it, and the revisers follow their example. The idea then is: he considered, *was well aware* of, etc., which seems to be quite apposite, since it is Abraham's faith that is characterized; and that would seem to be stronger if he had in mind the difficulties in the accomplishment of the promise than if these were entirely lost sight of.

In v. 1, 2, 8, the revisers adopt the Subjunctive Mode,  $\epsilon\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\nu \dots \kappa\alpha\nu\chi\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ , in opposition to the American committee, who would retain the old reading,  $\epsilon\chi\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ , etc. It is generally conceded that MSS. authority is strongly in favor of the hortative meaning, "let us have," etc., and only a supposed incongruity seems to influence those who adopt the declarative, "we have," etc. But is it unnatural, since the Christian graces, such as faith, hope, etc., are not merely bestowed, without any action of the recipient, but are also to be sought for and maintained, that the apostle should diverge a little from the narrative form of discourse to remind his hearers that they were not merely passive subjects in the matter, but active agents? The following context is quite as apposite to the hortatory as to the declarative text. Such passages as i. 16; viii. 1; ix. 28, 31, 32; x. 15; xi. 6; xiv. 6, 21; xv. 24, 29; xvi. 24, are manifestly improved by the omission of spurious words and clauses. A change of text is also an improvement; as, among other passages, in ii. 17; vi. 12; viii. 24; ix. 28; xi. 21, 22, 26; xiii. 7, 9; xiv. 6, 9, 10, 22; xv. 7, 8, 11.

In some passages, even in some above enumerated, the change of text does not particularly improve the English rendering of the passage, but still it is demanded by MSS. authority (cf. vii. 18).

#### CHANGES IN COLLOCATION.

It is impossible in one Article to notice all of the numerous changes in the collocation of verbs and clauses in the new

version. In some cases there is improvement enough to warrant a change; e.g. vi. 2.

## OLD VERSION.

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

## NEW VERSION.

We who died to sin, how shall we  
any longer live therein?

See also iv. 1; vi. 4; vii. 8; ix. 17; xiii. 6; xiv. 15. These passages are, however, many of them, it must be acknowledged, more improved by change of language than in collocation. In such passages as iv. 13; vii. 25; viii. 31; ix. 5; xii. 19, et al., it is very questionable whether the improvement is sufficient to warrant change; and xiv. 13 is a specimen of passages which seem to be absolutely injured by a change in collocation.

## CHANGES IN PARTICULAR WORDS AND PHRASES.

There is a great improvement in the rendering of some particular words and phrases in the Revised Version. *Ἐκτὸς νόμου*, always *without law* in the old version, is *apart from law* in the new. See iii. 21, where the idea is not without the works of the law, but independently, or without the aid of the law; cf. also iii. 28; iv. 6; vii. 8. The substitution of *creation* (used in its limited sense, excluding rational beings) for *creature* in viii. 19 sq., is a great improvement, and almost equal to a running commentary on the passage. I would suggest, too, that *κτίσις* in i. 25 would be better rendered *the thing made*, and the clause read, "worshipped and served *the thing made* rather than *the Maker*"; and in viii. 39, *created thing* is better than *creature*. *Condemnation* in iii. 8 is better than *damnation*, and the same word *κρίμα* might, perhaps, well have been rendered *condemnation* in xiii. 2. So *hindered* is better than *let* in i. 13; *divinity* than *Godhead* in i. 20; *righteous* than *just* in ii. 13; *united with* than *planted together* in vi. 5; and *graft* and *grafted* than *graft* and *grafted* in xi. 17-19, 23, 24; *affectionate* than *affectioned*, xii. 10; *instruction* than *learning* (both versions), xv. 4; *distinction* than *difference*, x. 12.

A large number of words are changed without apparent

necessity or improvement, and some with positive injury ; e.g. in i. 21 *foolish* to *senseless*. The latter word hardly seems suitable here, unless used in the strict sense of *foolish*. In ii. 7 *immortality*, the secondary meaning of ἀφθαρσίαν, seems far better than *incorruption*, which suggests too exclusively the fate of the body in the grave. In this same verse *patience* may be better than *patient continuance*, but *endurance* better than either. In ii. 20 *instructor* is better, and more literal, than *corrector*, though *guide* would be still more in accordance with the original idea in παιδευτής. In vi. 13, 16, 19, *yield*, though a less literal rendering of παρίστημι than *present*, implies a natural unwillingness which seems well indicated here. The substitution of *ignorant* for *know not* in vi. 8 ; vii. 1, would seem to be entirely unnecessary. The change of *time* (retained in xi. 5) to *season* in iii. 26 ; v. 6 ; ix. 9 ; xiii. 11, can scarcely be demanded, if it is not an absolute blemish.

The revisers would seem to have been specially fond of the word *reckon*, *reckoned*, etc. It is not, perhaps, so much to be objected to as used in iv. 3-8 for λογίζομαι, though *counted for* (vs. 3, 5) seems at least as well authorized as *reckoned for* ; and *imputed* (vs. 6, 8), where the act of God is directly referred to, is quite in keeping with the tone of the Scriptures elsewhere. In verses 22, 23, too, the old *imputed* seems to be entirely in place. But *reckon*, with the signification of "think," "suppose," as used in ii. 8 ; iii. 28, is provincial and local, not to say too colloquial to be employed in a translation of the Bible, and might well have been superseded by a better word in the few passages where it is found in the Authorized Version, as in vi. 11 ; viii. 18.

In xi. 28 it would seem to be better to change *touching* in the last, rather than repeat it in the first clause. The word, though sometimes used thus as a preposition, does not seem to be quite in accordance with the best usage, and *in respect to* or *in regard to* would express the meaning quite as well.

The use of *probation* for *experience* in the old version (v. 4) has been abundantly criticised by others ; but I can scarcely pass it by without a word. The fact that the word

is so manifestly appropriated to the designation of man's condition on the earth as a state of trial, would seem to preclude its use here. The idea is manifest: "the coming out of trial well"; but it is difficult to express it in one English word. Alford's *approval* comes, perhaps, as near to it as any one word, unless it is Meyer's *triedness*, which is hardly authorized.

We find some obsolete or nearly obsolete words and phrases retained; as *wot* for *know* in xi. 2, pronounced obsolete by Webster; *afore* in i. 2; ix. 23; *if so be that*, viii. 9, 17; and the unnecessary introduction anew of *howbeit* in vii. 7, and *aforetime* in iii. 25. The use of *none* as adjective for *no*, belonging to a noun, as of *none effect*, iv. 14, is at least not highly commendable. The retention of the antiquated and awkward *for to*, instead of simply *to* or *in order to*, in xi. 11 seems to us unaccountable.

Some phrases, too, seem hard to analyze grammatically or rhetorically; as "to *us-ward*" in viii. 18.

In this connection I may be allowed to speak of the retention of *Holy Ghost* in the text for *Holy Spirit* throughout the Romans. Ghost is certainly antiquated in such use; and to some persons, at least, is not suggestive of the highest reverence. In other parts of the New Testament, too, we find *Holy Ghost* retained sometimes, and sometimes changed to *Holy Spirit*, without apparently wholly satisfactory reasons for discrimination. In the use of the masculine pronoun referring to the Holy Spirit we find a desirable change in viii. 16, 26, 27, and cannot but wonder that *which* was not changed to *who* in v. 5, and that the American revisers prefer *itself* to *himself* in viii. 26, whilst they do not object to the masculine pronoun in other cases.

#### THE ELLIPSES IN THE OLD AND NEW VERSIONS.

In some passages the ellipses are better supplied in the new than in the old version; as in v. 16; vii. 10; viii. 31; ix. 4, 6; xii. 7; xiv. 21. In xv. 20 *already* is well supplied in the new version, but in xv. 31 *is* would be better than *I*

have of both versions, and in iii. 20 it is hardly necessary to change *is* of the old version to *cometh*.

Some words found in the old are well omitted in the new version; e.g. ii. 29; v. 16. In vi. 4 (*even*), where *like* might also be omitted from both versions; x. 6 (*from above*), 7 (*again*), 8 (*even*); xi. 4 (*image of*, etc.), 11 (*rather*); xiii. 7 (*therefore*).

Some examples of the awkward English in the Romans, which has been so abundantly criticised in other parts of the New Testament, may be found in i. 11; vii. 1, 18; ix. 5; xi. 11.

#### CHANGES IN PUNCTUATION.

In respect to the punctuation of the revised text of the Romans several things are noticeable. The first thing that strikes the eye is the abundant use of the colon where some other point would seem to be better, especially the semicolon. I need not cite passages, as the colons seem at a glance to be almost sown broadcast. The reservation of the colon mainly to introduce quotations is, I think, according to the best modern usage.

Several other changes of punctuation require notice. In i. 6 the omission of the comma after *also* would be an improvement, so as to make *called* a predicate with *are*: "Among whom are ye also called to be Jesus Christ's," or "of Jesus Christ." In iii. 8: "For what if some were without faith?" The interrogation would best be put after *For what*, and the Greek *τι γάρ* translated "what then?"<sup>1</sup> Then the remainder of the clause is the protasis of what follows: "If some were without faith, shall their want of faith," etc. See also iv. 1.

In quite a number of other passages the punctuation is improved in the Revised Version; e.g. iii. 25; so in vii. 8, 11.

#### OLD VERSION.

For sin taking occasion by the commandment deceived me, and by it slew me.

#### NEW VERSION.

For sin finding occasion, through the commandment beguiled me, and through it slew me.

<sup>1</sup> Buttmann's Grammar, § 150. 6.

In viii. 20, 21 there is decided improvement, and especially in the pointing.

## OLD VERSION.

For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected *the same* in hope,

Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

So in xi. 13, 14. In verse 13 the period of the new version is far preferable to the comma, which leaves the intermediate clause to oscillate between the first and last clauses.

## OLD VERSION.

For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office :

If by any means I may provoke to emulation *them which are* my flesh, and might save some of them.

## NEW VERSION.

For the creation was subjected to vanity, not of its own will, but by reason of him who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God.

## NEW VERSION.

But I speak to you that are Gentiles. Inasmuch then as I am an apostle of Gentiles, I glorify my ministry : if by any means I may provoke to jealousy *them that are* my flesh, and may save some of them.

Here, although it is not a matter of vital importance, it seems to me that the semicolon would be better than the colon at the end of vs. 13. So in vs. 3 of this chapter a colon would be better than a comma before the quotation, and a semicolon better than a colon after *altars*.

## THE MARGINAL READINGS.

There are several passages where the marginal reading seems preferable to the text ; as ii. 22, where "commit sacrilege" is also found in the old version. In viii. 4 the *requirement* of the law is better than *ordinance*. The latter word seems to have special reference to its author. We speak of the ordinance of God, or of sovereign power, but not of law, since it is itself equivalent to law. *Ordinances* is used in a similar manner in ii. 26. So viii. 13, *make to die* is better than *mortify*, but still better, perhaps, the preference of the American committee, *put to death*. The marginal reading in xii. 2 seems preferable to either the old or new version, especially as it is a more accurate translation of the Greek.

## OLD VERSION.

What is that (the) good and acceptable and perfect will of God.

## NEW VERSION.

The will of God, even the thing which is good and acceptable and perfect.

In the first part of this verse *conformed to* is unnecessarily changed to *fashioned according to*. In xi. 2 (27; xiv. 11), the marginal *in* is a better rendering of *ἐν* (*ἐν Ἡλίας*) than *to*, as the meaning plainly is *in the history* or *story* of Elijah. Many other passages might be cited, did our limits allow it.

#### THE EXAMINATION OF PARTICULAR PASSAGES.

Chapter I. — In vs. 4 the new version is an improvement upon the old version inasmuch as not Christ's resurrection only is designated, but that of others as involved in his. Hence it is, "the resurrection of (not *from*, *ἐκ*) the dead."

In vs. 12, although the new version is in some respects better than the old, still that would seem to be improved by substituting "by our common (not mutual, O. V.) faith" for "each of us by the others faith"; since the last clause, "both yours and mine," makes it sufficiently evident that the faith is the individual possession of both. Then the passage will read: "that I with you may be comforted among you, by our common faith, both yours and mine."

In vs. 18 it is somewhat difficult to decide between the meaning of the new version, "*hold down* the truth," and the margin and old version, "*hold* the truth," i.e. have a knowledge of it, and yet continue in sin; the latter seems more in accordance with the context, which goes on in the following verses to show that the Gentiles have the knowledge of God, and yet do not live in accordance with it. Still, the idea of *keeping back*, *hindering* the development of, may be the meaning; but, at any rate, the language of the new version, "*hold down*" is a little too suggestive of the temporary struggle of the wrestler, and "*keep down*" or "*hinder*" (preferred by the American committee) would be much better.

In vs. 19 the language of both versions, "that which *may be* known of God," is not true taken in its unrestricted sense, for *all* knowledge of God is not, of course, possessed without a special revelation,<sup>1</sup> which is excluded here. The classical

<sup>1</sup> So Schaff says: "The heathen did not know all that may be known of God; but as clearly appears from what follows they knew only that which may be learned from the general revelation in the book of nature and reason, as distinct from the special revelation in the Bible and in the person of Christ."

use of *γνωστόν*, *the knowable*, does not seem to be found in the Apocrypha and New Testament (Meyer); but it means "that which is known [*knowledge, quod notum est*] of God," i.e. from works of creation, without special revelation.

The last clause of vs. 20, too, is much contested. It cannot be questioned that *εἰς τό* with the Infinitive generally, if not always, in Paul's Epistles denotes *intention, purpose*, so that the revisers seem to be right in rendering here *in order that*, instead of *so that*, etc. Schaff (Lange's Com.) would retain the old rendering, and yet says that it denotes "(intended) result," which does not much help the matter in a *doctrinal* point of view. Neither does it seem necessary to deprecate the idea that God did purpose to make his divinity so clear in his works that man should be without excuse if he did not so recognize it.

Verse 23 is improved mainly by a proper rendering of the preposition *ἐν* (*ὁμοιώματι*), by *for* instead of *into*. This use of *ἐν*, rarely if ever found in classical Greek, after verbs of *bartering* or *exchanging*, is kindred with the Hebrew *א*, and is found in the LXX, as well as in the New Testament (See Ps. cvi. 20). Meyer brings it under the head of Instrumental Dative. This change of the preposition rendered a different translation of the verb *ἠλλάξαν* desirable, i.e. they *exchanged*, etc., just as the revisers rendered *μετήλλαξαν*, in vs. 25, *exchanged* instead of *changed* (O. V.).

In vs. 28 the new is an improvement upon the old version, but fails, as all the versions do, to give the full force of the Greek, which by a *paronomasia* which cannot be fully imitated in any other language, *ἔδοκίμασαν . . . ἀδόκιμον*, gives the connection between the conduct of the heathen and its results. We imitate the original imperfectly in English; as they *disapproved, reprobated* . . . God gave them up to a *disapproved, reprobate* mind. *Not fitting* in the last clause, too, is more in accordance with modern usage than *not convenient*, but *unseemly* would seem to be the more exact meaning of the word.

Chapter II. — In vs. 1-3 we have some characteristic changes of the new version.

## OLD VERSION.

Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things.

But we are sure that the judgment of God is according to truth against them which commit such things.

And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?

## NEW VERSION.

Wherefore thou art without excuse, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest dost practise the same things. And we know that the judgement of God is according to truth against them that practise such things. And reckonest thou this, O man, who judgest them that practise such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgement of God?

The substitution of *without excuse* for *inexcusable* is perhaps a slight gain in point of rhythm. *Dost practise* for *doest* (vs. 1) is a more accurate rendering of the verb *πράσσω*, and so in vs. 2, *practise* for *commit*, and in vs. 3 for *do*; but the substitution of *reckonest* for *thinkest* seems at least no improvement.<sup>1</sup> In vs. 3 *those who* would have been better than either *them which* of the old version or *them that* of the new version.<sup>2</sup>

Verse 15 is manifestly greatly improved in the new version.

## OLD VERSION.

Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another.

## NEW VERSION.

In that they shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith, and their thoughts one with another accusing or else excusing *them*.

Here the relative clause, introduced by *οἷτινες*, rendered *in that they* (since) and *for that they* in i. 25, gives a reason (See Meyer's Com.), and is an improvement every way upon the *which* of the old version. "Bearing witness *therewith*" gives the force of the *συν* in *συμμαρτυρούσης*, which "also bearing witness" (O. V.) does not. *Therewith*, i.e. with the conduct which is in accordance with the law as implied in the preceding clause.<sup>3</sup> The most difficult clause in the verse is, *μεταξὺ ἀλλήλων τῶν λογισμῶν, κ.τ.λ.*; but it is plain, I

<sup>1</sup> See p. 731.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 727.

<sup>3</sup> Meyer paraphrases well: "While they make known *outwardly* by their action that the *ἔργον* of the law is written in their hearts, their *inner moral consciousness* accords with it.

think, that *μεταξύ* is used as a preposition governing *ἀλλήλων* (and not as an adverb, *meanwhile*), *with one another*, i.e. thoughts against thoughts *accusing or else excusing*. It is unnecessary (Alford) to supply *them*. Others (Meyer) prefer to make *μεταξύ ἄλλ.* refer to persons and not thoughts, Gentile with Gentile. But although the general idea of the passage is much the same, the revisers have retained the most natural rendering; still, it might be well with the American revisers to add in margin "or *their thoughts accusing or else excusing them one with another.*"

Chap. III. — In vs. 9 *προεχόμεθα*, standing as it does by itself, may, without violence to its meaning, be rendered substantially as in the new version (Middle for Passive) *are we surpassed*, "are we in a worse case" than they; or actively, *do we bring forward excuse or defence*, "do we excuse ourselves," in margin of new version; or again, *do we (Jews) have the preference* (O. V.). The last seems to fit the context best, and is therefore preferable.<sup>1</sup>

## OLD VERSION.

Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.

Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin.

But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets;

Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference:

For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;

Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus:

Whom God hath set forth to be a pro-

## NEW VERSION.

Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it speaketh to them that are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may be brought under the judgement of God: because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for through the law cometh the knowledge of sin. But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe; for there is no distinction; for all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by his blood, to shew his righteousness, because of the pass-

<sup>1</sup> See Lange, Alford, Hodge, De Wette, et al.

pitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God;

To declare, *I say*, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.

ing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the shewing, *I say*, of his righteousness at this present season: that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus.

In vs. 19 *speakeeth* (N. V.) is a better rendering of λαλεῖ than *saieth*, since it merely designates the destination of the precepts of the law. In the last clause, that "all the world may become guilty [i.e. be self-condemned] before God" seems to us better than the new version, "brought under the judgment of God"; which is too general and indefinite. In vs. 20 διότι will not bear the old rendering *therefore*, but = *because*, the new. "*The works of the law*" (N. V.) is better than *the deeds*, and *there* (O. V.) is quite unnecessary. "*Through the law cometh the knowledge of sin*" is a shade more explicit, but not a very necessary alteration of the old version, "*by the law is the knowledge of sin.*" In vs. 21 "*the righteousness*" (O. V., elsewhere referred to) is better than "*a righteousness*"; but "*without the law*" (O. V.) is not so good as "*apart from the law*" (N. V.). In vs. 22 *distinction* (N. V.) is better than *difference*. In vs. 23 "*fall short*" would hardly seem a better rendering of ὑστεροῦνται than "*come short.*" In vs. 25 the true Aorist meaning is "*set forth*" (N. V.), not "*has set forth.*" The pointing of this verse by the revisers is doubtless an improvement upon the old version, as ἐν τῷ αἵματι, *by his blood*, is connected with προέθετο, *set forth*, and not with διὰ πίστεως "*through faith in his blood,*" but "*through faith, by his blood.*" In vs. 25, 26, there is manifest improvement upon the old version, as in it there is no hint of what sins are here referred to. Besides, πάρεσις does not, like ἄφεσις, signify *remission, forgiveness*, but a *passing over, overlooking*. The passage plainly refers to the forbearance of God in not punishing the sins of those who lived before the advent of Christ. This conduct of God might seem to those under the new dispensation to need jus-

tification. In vs. 26 the idea is that he *may* (better than *might*) *be*, i.e. "be seen or shown to be," "the justifier," etc. The preference of *time* (O. V.) to *season*, as in ix. 9, is spoken of elsewhere.

Chapter IV.—The American revisers are, it seems to me, right in vs. 1, connecting *κατὰ σάρκα* (according to the flesh) with *εὐρηκέναι* (hath found), and not with *προπάτερα* (our forefather). It is doubtless used in contrast to *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, and *ἐξ ἔργων* (vs. 2) is related to it as a part to the whole. The collocation and pointing should both be changed, "What then shall we say that Abraham our (fore)father hath found according to the flesh? <sup>1</sup>

## OLD VERSION.

Because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.

## NEW VERSION.

Because the love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Ghost which was given unto us.

Chap. V.—The new here follows the old version in the translation of *ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ* by *the love of God* instead of *God's love*, which seems plainly to be the meaning, i.e. "God's love for man," as in vs. 8, not "man's love for God." "*Hath been shed*" is a more literal translation of *ἐκέχυται* than "*is shed*"; and *was* than "*is given*" of *δοθέντος*. The unpardonable phrase "*Holy Ghost which*" is spoken of elsewhere.

## OLD VERSION.

Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned:

(For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law.

Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.

But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the

## NEW VERSION.

Therefore, as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin; and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned:—for until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression, who is a figure of him that was to come. But not as the trespass, so also is the free gift. For if by the trespass of the one the many died, much more did the grace of God, and the gift by the grace of the one

<sup>1</sup> See Lange's Comm. Text. Note by P. S.

grace of God, and the gift by grace, *which is* by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.

And not as *it was* by one that sinned, *so is* the gift: for the judgment *was* by one to condemnation, but the free gift *is* of many offences unto justification.

For if by one man's offence death reigned by one: much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.)

Therefore as by the offence of one *judgment came* upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one *the free gift came* upon all men unto justification of life.

For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound:

That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.

In vs. 12 *therefore*, *διὰ τοῦτο*, referring directly to the reasoning in vs. 1-11, is perhaps better than *wherefore*. The change in this verse, first clause, of *by* to *through* in the new version, as in other cases where *διὰ* is used with the Genitive, although as a general rule it is well, does not seem to me to be called for here. Man is properly designated as the *principal* cause of the introduction of sin into the world. "Passed *unto* (to)" is better than "passed *upon*," and perhaps *came* or *extended to* is better still; and *because* better than *for that*, used in both versions. The new version gives the true sense of the Aorist Tense in the last clause, *all sinned*, not *have sinned*. All became involved in Adam's sin, and here especially in its consequence, death. In vs. 14, "from Adam to Moses," *to* is unnecessarily changed to *until*. "Had

man, Jesus Christ, abound unto the many. And not as through one that sinned, *so is* the gift: for the judgement *came* of one unto condemnation, but the free gift *came* of many trespasses unto justification. For if, by the trespass of the one, death reigned through the one; much more shall they that receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness reign in life through the one, *even* Jesus Christ. So then as through one trespass *the judgment came* unto all men to condemnation; even so through one act of righteousness *the free gift came* unto all men to justification of life. 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. And the law came in beside, that the trespass might abound; but where sin abounded, grace did abound more exceedingly: that, as sin reigned in death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

not sinned" in both versions might be changed to "sinned not," the proper sense of the Aorist Tense (*ἀμαρτήσουστας*). In vs. 15 in the new version "*the one*" and "*the many*," and "*the one man*" and "*the many*," and *died* and *did abound* (Aorist Tense) are good corrections of the Authorized Version. *It was*, in vs. 16, first clause, is well omitted in the new version, and *so* might be without detriment. The brevity of the expression makes it a little obscure; but the idea is: not as in the case of the one, or as what took place by the one, is the free gift. *Came . . . came* is an improvement upon *was . . . is* of the old version. The article is well retained in the new version, vs. 17: "*the one*," three times repeated. *Therefore* seems unnecessarily changed to *so then* in vs. 18; but the remainder of the verse is improved in the Revised Version. *Δι' ἐνὸς παραπτώματος* does not mean "through the trespass of one" (O. V.), but "through one trespass" (N. V.). The former idea is expressed in vs. 17, *τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς παραπτώματι*. So *δι' ἐνὸς δικαίωματος* is "one righteous act." "*Came unto (to)*" is better than "*came upon*." In vs. 19 "*the one man's disobedience*" "*the many*" and "*the one*" and "*the many*" are an improvement on the old rendering. The next verse is also much improved, though *more* in the last clause might well be omitted; *abound exceedingly* fully expresses the idea of the Greek. *Reigned* is an improvement in the last verse, but it is questionable whether *by* (means of) is not as well as *through*.

## OLD VERSION.

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

## NEW VERSION.

We who died to sin, how shall we  
any longer live therein?

Chap. VI. — The arrangement of the clauses and the collocation of the words in the last clause in the new are an improvement upon the old version.<sup>1</sup> *Who*, too, is better than *that*, and *died* gives the proper rendering of the Aorist of the verb.

Verses 5, 6 are doubtless improved in the new version, but might perhaps be still further changed.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 730.

## OLD VERSION.

For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection :

Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with *him*, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.

## NEW VERSION.

For if we have become united with *him* by the likeness of his death, we shall be also by the likeness of his resurrection ; knowing this, that our old man was crucified with *him*, that the body of sin might be done away, that so we should no longer be in bondage to sin ;

*Σύμφυτοι*, by the translators of our Authorized Version was wrongly derived from *συμφυτεύω* (to plant together), and not from *συμφύω* (to bring forth or grow together). From the latter derivation *σύμφυτος* means “(closely) united” or perhaps “one with him by the likeness,” etc. But the marginal reading (N. V.) is more in conformity to the Greek, and better, avoiding the supplying of *him* in the first, and *in the likeness* in the last clause : “If we have become united with the likeness of his death, so shall we be also with his resurrection” (Alford). In vs. 6 the verb *συνεσταυρώθη* should be *was* (N. V.), not “is crucified” ; but *done away* is but a small, if any, improvement upon *destroyed* as a rendering of *καταργηθῆ* ; but with *σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας*, (the body as ruled by sin, the sin-body) perhaps *rendered powerless* would be still better. *Serve* needed scarcely to be changed to *be in bondage to*.

Chap. VII. — Verses 1–3, although in some respects improved, might, it is plain, be made still better, and in some particulars by conformity to the Authorized Version. *Are ye ignorant* (N. V.) is a questionable improvement upon *know ye not* (O. V.). Although *men that* is better than *them that*, still *those who* would be a more accurate rendering of the Greek Part. *γινώσκουσι*, and express the apostle’s idea distinctly enough. *How that* is awkward English, and *that* is all which the sense requires. It seems unnecessary to change “as long as he liveth” to “so long time as he liveth,” although the latter is a more exact transcript of the Greek. The article before “husband” would better be rendered by the possessive pronoun *her* (*her* husband), as it is in the old version in two of the cases, though not in the third. In the second verse τῷ ζῶντι ἀνδρὶ might be rendered “to *her*

living husband." *Die or have died* is better than *be dead*; but "*the law*" better than *law*, as the Mosaic law is doubtless referred to. "*Discharged from the law*" does not seem to me to be the best usage. We speak of a discharge from a penalty, duty, or service, but *freed* from a law. "*Her husband*," again, is better than "*the husband*" at the end of the verse, and so twice in the next verse. I cannot see the need, or even the desirability, of changing *married to* to *joined to* in vs. 3. *Γίνομαι* is used in a peculiar sense here with the Dative, to become, to come to, to be *married to*; so also in vs. 4.

The word *ἐπιθυμίαν*, in vs. 7, 8, is rendered in the old version first *lust*, and then *concupiscence*; and the verb *ἐπιθυμήσας*, *covet*. In the new version the nouns are *coveting* and the verb *covet*. The latter words are by ordinary usage nearly limited to one kind of wrong desire, and hence not applicable here. The same may be said of *concupiscence* and *lust*. The latter word, placed for these words in the margin of the new version, if it could be understood in its more general sense, would be quite appropriate. On the whole, perhaps it would be as well to render *ἐπιθυμίαν* in vs. 7 *evil desire*, and in vs. 8 *desire*, and the verb also *desire*, since the context sufficiently limits in the last two cases to *inordinate* or *evil* desire. The clauses would then read, "I had not known *evil desire*, if the law had not said, thou shalt not *desire*; but sin . . . finding occasion . . . wrought in me . . . all manner of [*evil*] *desire*." "*Finding* occasion" is small, if any, improvement upon "*taking* occasion; but "*if the law had not said*" is better than "*except the law*," etc. (both versions). There is decided improvement in punctuation in both the tenth and eleventh verses.<sup>1</sup>

Verse 15 is improved in the Revised Version by giving a more accurate translation of the original.

## OLD VERSION.

That which I do, I allow not; for what I would, that do I not, etc.

## NEW VERSION.

That which I do I *know* (*γινώσκω*) not: for not what I would, that do I *practise* (*πράσσω*).

<sup>1</sup> See p. 733.

Chap. VIII. — In this chapter there is, I think, a want of consistency and discrimination in the use of the capital letter in connection with the word “spirit.” We find the capitals in vs. 2, 9 (*bis*), 11 (*bis*), 14, 16, 23, 26 (*bis*), 27, indicating that in these cases the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Trinity, is designated; in 4, 5 (*bis*), 6, 9 (second clause), 10, 13, 15 (*bis*), 16, the capital is not used, as not referring to the Holy Spirit. In the sixteenth verse *πνεύματι* is limited by *ἡμῶν*, and has no reference to the Holy Spirit with whom it is contrasted; and in the fifteenth verse *δουλείας* also characterizes *πνεῦμα* in the first clause, and shows what the Spirit received was not, as *νόθεσias* indicates what it was, or what its effect was, i.e. *adoption*, which could be no other than the Holy Spirit. In vs. 10 *τὸ πνεῦμα* is contrasted with *τὸ σῶμα*, and may well be rendered “your body . . . your spirit.” But vs. 4, 5, 6, 9, 13 are so connected with those which all acknowledge as referring to the Holy Spirit that we can scarcely otherwise interpret them. It is noticeable that not *σῶμα* (body), but *σὰρξ* (flesh), i.e. the natural man as alienated from God, is the antithesis of *πνεῦμα*. Now in vs. 4 must not the walking after the Spirit be the ordering of the life after the law of the Spirit of life, vs. 2? And in vs. 6 must not “the Spirit which is life” be identical with “the Spirit of life,” vs. 2? In vs. 13, too, is not the Spirit that gives life, as contrasted with the living after the flesh which is death, the same that makes “free from the law of sin and of death,” vs. 2? Compare also with these passages, especially with vs. 4, Gal. v. 16, 17, where the revisers recognize a reference to the Holy Spirit.

In vs. 7 the new version supplies *it* in the clause, “It is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can [it] be,” but it would be still further improved by giving the genuine Middle sense to *ὑποτάσσεται*, “It does not *submit itself* to the law of God, neither indeed can it.”<sup>1</sup>

In vs. 13 we have an improved version with a nice discrimination. In the old version *μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκειν . . . ζήσεσθε*

<sup>1</sup> See Alford, Lange, et al.

is rendered "shall die . . . shall live," but in the new, "must die . . . shall live." The apostle doubtless intends to designate by μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκειν the *necessary* result of living after the flesh, *death*, but simple result in the future by ζήσεσθε.

Verse 26 can hardly be said to be much improved in the new version. The change of *likewise* to *in like manner* does not seem to be demanded here. *Infirmity* does not, though literal, give the idea better than *infirmities*. *Weakness* would perhaps be better than either. *What* seems plainly a better rendering of τὸ . . . τί than *how*, and so it is translated in Luke i. 62. The manner is doubtless implied, but rather in καθὸ δεῖ (as is fitting), which expresses much the same idea as κατὰ θεὸν in vs. 27. "The Spirit *himself*," better than *itself*. Following the corrected text, with ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν omitted, it seems hardly necessary to add, as the revisers have done "for us," as the ὑπὲρ in ὑπερευγγάχει is sufficiently expressed by the idea of advocacy in *maketh intercession*.

Chap. IX. — Verse 5 (with the other doxologies, i. 25; xi. 36; xvi. 27). It is pleasant to see that the revisers considered it necessary to point and render the doxology in vs. 5, in accordance with the Authorized Version, as referring to Christ; as did most of the Fathers, and as do many of the best modern scholars.<sup>1</sup> The change in supplying *is* for *came*, and the arrangement of the words, "of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh," is perhaps a slight improvement in the new version. Why the revisers felt it necessary in all the doxologies, i. 25; ix. 5; xi. 36; xvi. 27, to add in the margin, instead of *forever* (εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας), "Gr. *unto the ages*," it is difficult to understand. The Greek should be what it is in *the* connection, not in some other connection. *Unto*, though used much in the Bible, Webster pronounces to be "obsolete and not legitimate." However that may be, *blessed unto the ages* needs translation about as much as the original Greek, and the constant reference to this phrase

<sup>1</sup> Alford says the translation, "of whom is Christ . . . , who is God over all blessed forever," is "the only one admissible by the rules of Grammar and arrangement."

seems to imply doubt whether *forever* is a legitimate translation of the Greek *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*. The text is questionable in xvi. 27; but the retention of the relative *ὃς*, as the revisers have done, is best authorized; but it probably refers to God (*Θεῶς*), the chief subject of the sentence, and not to Christ (*Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*), the nearer antecedent.

The new version of vs. 9 is hardly an improvement upon the old. The change of *the* (*ὁ*) to *a* is unnecessary and arbitrary. As the Greeks use *λόγος* referring to several words, i.e. *sentence, saying*, etc., I do not see any objection to rendering *ἐπαγγελίας ὁ λόγος*, the words of the promise are these, i.e. the words of the last clause: "At [or *about*] this time [next year]," etc. This is in accordance with the Hebrew *בְּחַיֵּינוּ*, *at the living time*, i.e. when this time just past, *dead*, revives. It seems hardly to mean as the LXX, *κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον εἰς ὥρας*, might seem to imply, when this *season*, i.e. spring or summer, comes again.<sup>1</sup>

The rendering of vs. 15 in the new version is both more in accordance with the Greek and the context than the Authorized Version.

## OLD VERSION.

I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion.

## NEW VERSION.

I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion.

In vs. 21 *power* of the old version is a better rendering of *ἐξουσίαν* than *right* (N. V.); and *mass* would be better than *lump* of both versions; but in the last part of the verse the gender of *ὁ μὲν . . . ὁ δὲ* separating them from *σκεῦος*, sanctions the rendering of the Revised Version, "one part a vessel (un)to honor, and another (un)to dishonor."

Verse 28 is greatly improved in text and translation in the new version; for *λόγος*, though it has many and varied meanings, never signifies work, but here (prophetic) word. The superiority of the new version is plain by comparison.

## OLD VERSION.

He will finish the work, and cut it short in righteousness; because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth.

## NEW VERSION.

The Lord will execute his word upon the earth, finishing it and cutting it short.

<sup>1</sup> See Meyer, Alford, and De Wette upon this passage.

Chap. XII.—In vs. 1-3 the new follows the old version in text and pointing, but with some variation in rendering. The authority of MSS. seems to favor the Infinitives in vs. 2, *συσχηματίζεσθαι* and *μεταμορφοῦσθαι* (instead of the Imperatives, O. V. and N. V.), dependent upon *παρακαλῶ*, vs. 1. The new version and the Greek and English connection would differ as follows :

I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, *which* is your reasonable service. And be not fashioned according to this world : but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God.

Παρακαλῶ . . . παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα     I beseech you . . . to present your  
 . . . , καὶ μὴ συσχηματίζεσθαι τῷ αἵῳ     bodies . . . , and not to be conformed,  
 τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ μεταμορφοῦσθαι, κ.τ.λ.     but to be transformed," etc.

This as far as symmetry of construction is concerned is preferable to the old text. In the first verse the rendering of the Infinitive *παραστήσαι* in the old version *that ye present* is slightly improved in the new, *to present* ; but the *fashioned according to* of vs. 2 seems to me not as apposite as the old *conformed to*, since the ground-meaning of the two verbs is almost identical, and the contrast is entirely in the compounded prepositions, which is well indicated in the old translation. In vs. 3 *so to think as to think soberly*, though rather awkward English, is a more complete translation of the Greek, *φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν*, than *to think soberly*. Alford attempts to give the paronomasia of the passage, *μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν*, κ.τ.λ. "*clumsily*," as he says : "not to be high-minded above that which he ought to be minded, but to be so minded as to be sober-minded."

Verse 8, "He that giveth let him do it with *liberality*." The last word is scarcely better than the old *simplicity*, the most natural meaning of *ἀπλότης*. The exhortation seems to be to give *unostentatiously*, *without pretence*. In this same verse *ἐν σπουδῇ* does not seem to be well rendered by *with diligence*. That does not sufficiently characterize the spirit of ruling. *Zeal* comes as near to it, perhaps, as any one word, since it gives the meaning *σπουδῇ* well, and char-

acterizes the spirit that one who *presides* should possess, and also implies *activity*. In vs. 11, too, τῆ σπουδῇ is badly rendered *business* in the old version, and the clause τῆ σπουδῇ μὴ ἄκηροί, *slothful in diligence*, is scarcely better, as the not being slothful is implied in *diligence*. Alford's "in zeal not remiss" seems much better.

Verses 16, 17, "Mind not high things" (O. V.) seems to me quite as good as "Set not your mind on high things" (N. V.); but neither of them seems to give the exact thought. Φρονεῖν is used here with ἕψηλά just as it is in classical Greek with μέγα, μέγιστον, μικρά, etc., *to be minded*, in the way indicated by the adverb; so μέγα φρονεῖν, oftenest in a bad sense "to be *presumptuous, proud,*" etc., here with ἕψηλά, "be not *loftily* minded," i.e. be not *arrogant*, setting yourself above others in your thoughts and feelings. We have the antithesis of this in the modified form, τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι, "be led away with, be condescending to the lowly." It seems altogether probable, at least, that ταπεινοῖς should be taken as masculine, since it is elsewhere so used in the New Testament, and the verb, συναπάγω, is changed from the verb of the preceding clause, and is most naturally, especially with the συν, followed by a personal object. In vs. 17, although *honorable* (N. V.) may be better than *honest* (O. V.) as a translation of καλά, it seems to me that a more general word, as *noble* or *good*, would be better than either.

Chap. XIII. — Verse 5 would seem to be easily translated without violence to the Greek so as to be readily understood, which it is not now, by rendering the article τὴν ὀργὴν and τὴν συνείδησιν by the possessive pronoun, "his anger" and "your conscience." Then with one or two other slight changes the passage would read, "You must needs subject yourselves not only on account of [i.e. to avoid] his anger, but for your own conscience' sake."

Chap. XV. — I must believe that the American committee are right in their interpretation of vs. 6 in the margin<sup>1</sup> (as well as 2 Cor. i. 3; xi. 31; Eph. i. 3; Col. i. 8; 1 Pet. i.

<sup>1</sup> See List of Readings, xiii.

8) ; although the version of the revisers is so ably defended by Professor Tyler.<sup>1</sup> That Paul would speak of the Father as *God of Christ* would hardly seem probable, unless the language of these passages *requires* such an interpretation, which it seems to me it does not. First, Θεός is much the more frequently used with the article, where in English we omit it, and hence is naturally so used here, without reference to the following clause *καὶ πατέρα, κ.τ.λ.* But, secondly, the article may be used, as Meyer says, merely to bind the conceptions of God and *Father of Christ* into unity, and does not *necessarily require* that the Genitive following should limit both nouns,<sup>2</sup> although that is a general principle of the Greek language, where both are common nouns. Thirdly, passages where the Genitive τοῦ κυρίου, κ.τ.λ., is not found after πατήρ, as in 1 Cor. xv. 24 ; Eph. v. 20, make it at least probable that the rendering *God and* (or even) *the Father* is the right one here ; since even the revisers in these passages render τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρί, “to God even the Father,” though they strangely feel obliged to put “Gr. *the* God and Father” in the margin. In Col. iii. 17, and in James i. 27, they render the same words “our God and Father,” unless possibly here they may have adopted a text with ἡμῶν, as in Col. iii. 17 they omit *καὶ* in the text, though it is retained by Hahn, Griesbach, and others.

A large number of passages, not above spoken of, are more or less improved in various ways in the Revised Version, e.g. i. 9, 10, 13 ; ii. 20 ; iii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 29 ; iv. 6, 9, 12, 19<sup>3</sup> ; v. 7 ; vi. 5, 10, 13, 17, 21 ; vii. 5, 6, 13 ; viii. 6, 17, 20, 21, 28 ; ix. 15, 17, 18, 22, 23, 26 ; x. 3, 5, 12, 14, 15 ; xi. 12, 16–19, 22, 30–32 ; xii. 5, 7, 8, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 ; xiii. 3, 10 ; xiv. 14, 15 ; xv. 2, 5, 17, 18–21 ; xvi. 2, 19, 25, 26, et al.

Some also are both injured and improved or improvable ;

<sup>1</sup> Bib. Sac., Jan. 1882, p. 180.

<sup>2</sup> Meyer says unhesitatingly “that τοῦ κυρίου, κ.τ.λ., clearly belongs only to πατέρα not also to θεόν.” See also De Wettes and others.

<sup>3</sup> Especially by an improved Greek Text.

e.g. among others, ii. 25. In iii. 3 "did not believe" is as good as "were without faith" and "unbelief" as "without faith"; but "the faithfulness of God" better than "the faith of God"; whilst "without effect" is perhaps better than "of none effect," and "ineffectual" would, I think, be better than either. Chap. iii. 21 is improved by rendering *χωρίς νόμου* "apart from the law," and placing it in a prominent position, and giving the Perf. Tense its appropriate rendering; and injured by the substitution of *a* for *the*. See also iii. 28; vi. 3; vii. 13, et al. Others, almost innumerable, are at least unnecessarily changed; such as ii. 23; iii. 4; iv. 15; vi. 3; vii. 1; ix. 6; xiv. 2, 3, et al. *saepe*.

---

## ARTICLE VI.

### DR. DORNER'S POSITION WITH REGARD TO PROBATION AFTER DEATH.<sup>1</sup>

BY REV. WM. HENRY COBB, UXBRIDGE, MASS.

THE book whose title appears below will without doubt be widely studied in America; for there is no living German theologian whose works are oftener seen in our public and private libraries than those of Dr. Dorner. We are greatly indebted to European scholars for the enrichment of many departments of theology; but it should not be forgotten that the doctrine of future punishment has been worked out more consistently and thoroughly here than in any other country. Discussions on this subject seem indigenous to the soil of America, and are multiplied from year to year. Nor is this strange; for no "state church" has given our people the impression that their salvation was secured at birth or baptism. Every man not an open sceptic stands in full

<sup>1</sup> A System of Christian Doctrine. By Dr. I. A. Dorner, Oberconsistorialrath and Professor of Theology, Berlin. Translated by Professors Alfred Cave and J. S. Banks. In four volumes. Vol. iv. Translated by Prof. Banks. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1882.