

the war of Schmalkald the body of the reformer was removed by his friends to a secret spot, whence it was never retransported to Wittenberg. The object of the removal is found naturally enough in a desire to save the remains from possible insult at the hands of the enemy. Köstlin finds the earliest trace of such a belief in an oration by a Professor Neumann of Wittenberg (1707), who refers to it as *vetus opinio et quasi per manus tradita*. Neumann does not indeed appear to have shared the opinion, and Köstlin is able to cite an earlier authority, a Wittenberg theologian of 1602, who thanks God for the providence which in 1547 secured 'ut Lutheri sepulchrum et cadaver intacta prorsus et inviolata manerent.' The origin of the story is difficult to trace, but it will be a

a relief to many to be assured that it is no cenotaph, but the real tomb of the German reformer that is shown at Wittenberg.

Systematic Theology.

We have to call the attention of readers to the issue of the third 'Abtheilung' of the *Theol. Jahresbericht*. This contains a list, with brief notices, of the works in Systematic Theology which appeared during the year 1895. Like its predecessors in the same series, it may be safely commended for that completeness and correctness which will make it invaluable for reference.

J. A. SELBIE.

Maryculter.

The Doctrinal Significance of the Revised Version.

BY THE REV. GEORGE MILLIGAN, B.D., CAPUTH.

THIRD PAPER.

WHEN we pass to passages in the Revised Version bearing on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, we cannot but join in the widely-expressed regret that the Revisers did not see their way to adopt the uniform rendering of 'Spirit' for the Greek πνεῦμα, but in numerous passages have retained the archaic word 'Ghost.' For not only is the word now meaningless, except in the sense of disembodied spirit, but its use obscures the vital relation between the spirit of man and the Spirit of God. That, yielding to the demands of the context, the Revisers have made the change in certain passages,—such as Luke ii. 25-27, 'the Holy Spirit was upon him . . . it had been revealed unto him by the Holy Spirit . . . he came in the Spirit'; or iv. 1, 'Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit . . . was led by the Spirit'; or 1 Cor. xii. 3, 4, 'and no man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit. . . . There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit,'—only makes us wish the more that it had been consistently maintained.

Moreover, had this been done, it might have been found more possible to preserve the important distinction between πνεῦμα with and without the definite article. In the first case, it would seem always to point to the personal Spirit; in the second, to mark rather one of His manifestations

or operations.¹ English idiom would in any case have made this distinction very difficult to observe; but while we cannot speak of 'in Holy Ghost,' still less of 'in Ghost,' we might have grown accustomed to 'in Holy Spirit' and 'in Spirit.'² As, however, this distinction is not made in the Revised Version, it lies beyond our present scope to dwell upon it further,³ and we must pass to another point, the well-known designation of the Holy Spirit, ὁ παράκλητος. Here again, contrary to expectation, the translation 'Comforter' has retained its place in the text; but the margin at least supplies us with the more exact rendering 'Advocate,' in the active sense of one who helps or pleads in our behalf. An important aspect of the Spirit's work, otherwise apt to be lost sight of, is in this way brought before us; while none can now

¹ See Westcott, *Commentary on St. John*, vii. 39.

² A similar distinction between νόμος, abstract law, and ὁ νόμος, its embodiment in Mosaic law, has been largely observed throughout such passages as Rom. ii. 12, iii. 19 sq., iv. 13 sq., vii. 1 sq., Gal. iii. 10 sq., though, unfortunately, the amended translation is often relegated to the margin. Where no correction has been made, as in Rom. ii. 25, 27 (second occurrence); iii. 21; iv. 14; Gal. iii. 11, 18, 21, 23, the meaning correspondingly suffers.

³ Its theological significance will be found discussed by Professor Milligan, *The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord*, p. 204 sq.

miss the connexion established between the work of the Spirit and the work of our Lord. It is He who Himself is 'an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous' (1 John ii. 1), who promises that He will 'pray the Father, and He shall give you another Advocate, that He may be with you for ever, *even* the Spirit of truth' (John xiv. 16). The personality of this Spirit gains, too, new emphasis from the use of masculine pronouns in Rom. viii. 16 and 26, and Eph. iv. 30; the wide range of His influence, by the omission of the words 'unto Him' in John iii. 34, by which in the Authorized Version the reference is limited to the Son; and His continual ministry, by the correct translation of the present tense in 1 Thess. iv. 8; 'God, who giveth His Holy Spirit unto you.'

The doctrine of the Sacraments may next demand our attention, and here again the variations in the rendering of familiar texts, though they may appear at first of no great importance, involve far-reaching truths. Thus Baptism is no longer represented as 'in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost' (Matt. xxviii. 19), as if there were a kind of sacred charm in the mere words; but it is baptism 'into the name,'—as the expression, according to the common scriptural use, of the whole character of God, the sum of the whole Christian revelation. The knowledge of God as Father, the spiritual birthright of Sonship, the power and advocacy of the Spirit,—all these privileges belong to those who in the divinely-appointed rite are incorporated into the divine Name (cf. Acts viii. 16, xix. 5).¹

In the case of the Lord's Supper, the well-known description in 1 Cor. xi. furnishes us with an alteration which at once arrests our attention. In verse 27 the Revisers, following the best-supported Greek text, substitute 'or' for 'and'—'Wherefore whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily.' It is hardly necessary to say that not the slightest additional support is thereby given to the Romish practice of administering the sacrament to the laity only in one kind; the utmost that St. Paul's language implies in this direction is that the one part of the

¹ As an example of a change so slight as to be apt to pass unremarked, and yet full of significance, we may point to the omission of the 'of' before 'the Spirit' in John iii. 5, whereby 'water' and 'the Spirit' are shown to be, not two independent mediating agencies, but essentially connected. See Ellicott, *On the Revision of the English Testament*, p. 75, note 1.

sacrament might possibly be received without the other. But, taking a wider view of the verse, the Revisers' emendation serves to emphasise, what we are otherwise prepared for, that the two parts of the rite have a distinct meaning. The Bread—that is, the Body of Christ—recalls more particularly His glorified Humanity, for it is noteworthy that our Lord says nothing over the Bread, directly connecting it with the thought of an offering for sin;² whereas with the Cup—that is, His Blood—He definitely connects His atoning work. It is the 'Blood of the covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins' (Matt. xxvi. 28). 'We are not first purified from our sins, and then incorporated into Christ. When we have been brought, just as we are, into the communion of His Body, then we are in a position to receive the cleansing action of His once outpoured Blood.'³

If a bias against Rome influenced, as is sometimes alleged, the authorised rendering of 1 Cor. xi. 27, an undue bias in favour of Calvinistic doctrine has been found in certain other passages. The charge is, we believe, to a large extent an unjust one; for in most of the renderings so cited the translators of 1611 appear simply to have followed older authorities.⁴ But, in any case, the Revisers have been careful to remove all cause of complaint. Thus the obnoxious word 'given' has been removed from Matt. xx. 23, into which it had found its way through the Genevan Version; 'foreordained' and 'in whom' disappear from the margins of Rom. iii. 25 and v. 12 respectively; 'if they shall fall away' (*καὶ παραπεσόντας*) in Heb. vi. 6 gets its true aorist force, 'and *then* fell away,' while the marginal, 'the while,' makes it clear that it is only so long as men go on crucifying to themselves the Son of God that renewal is impossible; and, most important perhaps of all, the rendering in Heb. x. 38, 'If *any man* draw back' (the italics were first introduced in 1638),—a rendering supposed to be conceived in the interests of the doctrine of final perseverance,—gives place to, 'And if he shrink back.'

² In 1 Cor. xi. 24 the word *κλώμενον*, "broken," disappears according to the best reading; while in 1 Cor. x. 16, 17 the breaking of *the bread* is clearly the participation of the many in the one *living* Body (cf. Dr. Hort's *Life*, vol. ii. p. 213).

³ Mason, *The Faith of the Gospel*, p. 305.

⁴ See an article by Archdeacon Farrar on 'Fidelity and Bias in Versions of the Bible' in *The Expositor*, 2nd ser., iii. p. 280.

The freedom, indeed, of man's will, and the need of a definite exercise of it in the realisation of the offered blessings, both obtain fresh prominence in the Revised Version. The word for 'conversion,' for example, is always properly rendered actively instead of passively, and the popular error of men's being merely passive instruments in the hands of God thereby exploded. 'Except ye turn' is our Lord's warning to His disciples (not 'Except ye be converted'), and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven' (Matt. xviii. 3).¹

In St. John's Gospel, again, its proper force is given to the Greek word for 'will' (*θέλω*), which, as rendered in the Authorized Version, seems often simply to mark the future. 'Wouldest thou,' that is, hast thou the will, the desire to 'be made whole?' is the full force of Jesus' question to the impotent man at Bethesda (v. 6). To the twelve at Capernaum He says, 'Would ye also go away?' (vi. 67, 'Numquid vultis?' Vulg.). While more pointedly still, 'If any man will do His will' becomes 'If any man willeth to do His will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God or whether I speak from Myself' (vii. 17); the whole force of the argument lying 'in the moral harmony of the man's purpose with the divine law so far as this law is known or felt.'² In the same connexion the force of the reflexive pronoun in chs. v. 42 ('love of God in yourselves'), vi. 53 ('life in yourselves'), and xvii. 19 ('that they themselves also may be sanctified'), ought not to be missed as bringing out that the appropriation of the life of Christ on the part of believers, 'so far from extinguishing their individuality, responsibility, and freedom, rather brings these prominently forward as characteristics especially distinguishing them.'³ Regarded indeed together, all believers form a single great abstract unity, which God has given to Christ. 'Whatsoever Thou has given Him' (*πάν ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ*),—neuter-singular, so strange at first sight when applied to a company of men, but which gives place at once to the masculine-plural, when the thought passes to the individuals on whom in His turn the Son bestows His gift,—'to them He

should give eternal life' (*δώσῃ αὐτοῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, John xvii. 2; cf. v. 24).⁴

Therefore, too, it is that in Christ we have not only 'redemption' as a general gift, as in Authorized Version, but 'our redemption,' the redemption which meets our individual needs (Eph. i. 7); and again when the Lord comes, 'Who will both bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of the hearts,' the promise is, 'Then shall each man have his praise from God'—a much more personal promise than 'Then shall every man have praise of God' (1 Cor. iv. 5).

The word 'manifest' in this last passage introduces us to yet another line of doctrinal truth, which the Revised Version helps to make clear. Christ's coming again⁵ is represented by all the apostolic writers as far more than an appearing. It is a manifestation, a showing forth of Himself openly to the world as He actually is (Col. iii. 4; 1 Pet. v. 4; 1 John ii. 28); while the result of such manifestation in like manner is that men too 'shall be made manifest' (2 Cor. v. 10). All outward disguises by which they have deceived themselves or the world will be stripped from them. They will be shown in their inmost being, and consequently on this showing the appropriate reward or punishment will immediately and necessarily follow. Those whose life has been 'hid with Christ in God' shall then 'also with Him be manifested in glory' (Col. iii. 4); 'and then too shall be revealed the lawless one, whom the Lord Jesus . . . shall bring to nought by the manifestation of His coming' (2 Thess. ii. 8).⁶

How familiar indeed the thought of this great day was to the minds of the early Christians,

⁴ With this may be compared the Pauline, 'For ye are all one man in Christ Jesus' (Gal. iii. 28), 'not "one" only in the abstract by the acknowledgment of a real fellowship . . . but one man . . . one by the presence of a vital energy, guided by one law, one will, to one end' (Westcott, *The Victory of the Cross*, p. 41).

⁵ In a very deep sense this Coming is not future at all, but present—'The day of the Lord is now present' (not 'at hand') (2 Thess. ii. 2). Compare our Lord's own words, 'Henceforth,' that is from this time onwards, and not merely hereafter, 'ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power' (Matt. xxvii. 64); and St. John's revelation of the glory of the redeemed, 'They reign (not "shall reign") upon the earth' (Rev. v. 10).

⁶ We may here call attention to the emphasis laid on the Personality of the Devil in the revised renderings of Matt. v. 37, vi. 13; John xvii. 15; Eph. vi. 16; 2 Thess. iii. 3; 1 John v. 18, 19. The masculine pronoun in Mark xiii. 14 should also be noted.

¹ Cf. Matt. xiii. 15; Mark iv. 12; Luke xxii. 32; John xii. 40; Acts iii. 19, xxviii. 27.

² Westcott, *in loco*.

³ Prof. Milligan, *The Ascension*, p. 188.

and how vividly its imagery was conceived, is proved by the constant use of the definite article with reference to its accompaniments, a use which the Revised Version alone brings out. It is with 'the clouds' that Christ cometh (Rev. i. 7), and by 'the falling away,' and the revealing of 'the man of sin,' that that coming will be preceded (2 Thess. ii. 3). Not merely into 'outer darkness' but into 'the outer darkness' shall the unprofitable be cast, where shall be 'the weeping and gnashing of teeth' (Matt. viii. 12; cf. xiii. 42, 50; xxii. 13; xxiv. 51; xxv. 30; Luke xiii. 28). While again it is from 'the wrath' that Christ's people are saved (Rom. v. 9), and in 'the white robes' that those who have come out of 'the great tribulation' are arrayed (Rev. vii. 13, 14). Nor is it only for 'a city which hath foundations' that they are encouraged to look, but for 'the city which hath the foundations' (Heb. xi. 10).

The bearing of the Revised Version upon the Future State opens up too many questions to be discussed in the closing sentences of this paper. But how significant its bearing is, and how widely it may come to modify the popular views of the Hereafter, must be obvious to all who keep in view the following facts: (1) the words 'damnation,' 'damned,' 'damnable,' have wholly disappeared — 'condemnation,' 'judgment,' and their cognates, taking their place; (2) 'hell,' when referring generally to the unseen world beyond the grave, becomes 'Hades'; when punishment, as a part of that state, is implied, it is retained; but even then 'Gehenna,' the literal

meaning of the word in the original, always finds a place in the margin; (3) 'everlasting,' as applied alike to future bliss or future woe, is replaced by 'eternal,' a word which does not express endless duration in time, but that which transcends time, very much what we otherwise designate 'spiritual,' or, if the element of time does enter into it, rather suggests a fixed period, 'age-long,' or 'through the ages.'¹

There are many other points with which, if space had permitted, we would gladly have dealt, such as the restoration to its true dignity of the human body in Phil. iii. 21 ('the body of our humiliation' for 'our vile body'); the substitution of 'flock' for 'fold' in John x. 16, where the Authorized Version has had a most disastrous effect in confirming the false claims of the Roman see; or the fresh light which is thrown upon the doctrine of inspiration by the amended form of 2 Tim. iii. 16, 'Every scripture inspired of God *is* also profitable for teaching,' a very different thing from saying, 'All scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable for doctrine.' But enough, we trust, has been said to show what a rich field for inquiry lies before the student in the careful comparison of the two Versions, and how often changes, which at first may seem unnecessary, or even trifling, are attended with the gravest doctrinal consequences.

¹ See these changes discussed from his own point of view, but with great moderation of language, in a paper by the late Dr. S. Cox in *The Expositor*, 2nd ser. iii. p. 434 sq. Some remarks by Dr. Roberts on the same subject will be found in *The Expository Times*, iii. p. 549 sq.

At the Literary Table.

THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

PART II.

THE PRINCIPLE OF THE INCARNATION. BY H. C. POWELL, M.A. (*Longmans*. 8vo, pp. xxxi+483.) 'Behold, how great a matter a little fire kindleth!' It was the discovery that the 110th Psalm was *not* written by David, and it has opened the whole question of our Lord's personality, producing the great theological controversy of our generation. And now

it is found that to assert the contrary, and say that the 110th Psalm *was* written by David, does not settle the controversy or even appreciably affect it. The question of our Saviour's human knowledge has been raised; it cannot be laid to rest till the ground is covered and every pathway marked and measured.

The two most serious efforts to grapple with and