

ARTICLE VIII.

A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF "THE BIBLE
OF 1911."

BY THE REVEREND RANDOLPH H. MCKIM, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L.,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

"The Bible of 1911" was an enterprise undertaken by the Oxford University Press in celebration of the three hundredth anniversary of the issue of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures. It was intended not as a "new version" of the Bible, but as a "commemorative edition," which, "while preserving the form, the dignity, the high religious value and literary beauty, of the version of 1611, shall be freed by careful revision from the archaic grammatical forms and errors in translation which are in no sense essential features, but which on the contrary are recognized defects." The editors were instructed to change the text of the A. V. only where "(1) it is misleading; i. e., where the English rendering misses the point of the original or perverts the meaning"; "(2) where the A. V. has an obscure rendering of a passage sufficiently clear in the Hebrew and Greek texts"; "(3) where the A. V. is infelicitous in the choice of English words, even if not exactly misleading"; "(4) words obsolete are to be exchanged for words now in the usage of good writers." In communicating to myself these instructions, the representative of the Oxford University Press stated that "these better renderings are at hand in the many revisions and translations which have appeared during the last fifty years." The

editors (appointed in December, 1909, and January, 1910) were instructed in January, 1910, that their first revision should be in the hands of the editor-in-chief by the first of March, 1910; and that copy for the work should be in the hands of the printer by October, 1910.

Having been honored by being appointed one of the editors of this interesting work, I have felt great reluctance to make a public criticism of the manner in which the task has been performed; but as my association in this task not only conferred an honor, but imposed a responsibility to the public, I have finally concluded that I am under obligation to point out how seriously the execution of this enterprise has fallen short of the program according to which it was undertaken. In view of the high encomiums passed upon "The Bible of 1911," by a large part of the Christian press, and by many prominent scholars and theologians, my criticism of the work may possibly have little weight with the public; but at least I shall have freed myself of responsibility for the many errors which, in my judgment, this edition contains. I should add that it was understood from the beginning that the editors should receive no pecuniary compensation for their labor. This fact makes me the more free to express my honest opinion of the work.

It must not be supposed, by those who read my criticisms in this article, that I am insensible to the merits which the work unquestionably contains,—its preservation of the flavor of the Authorized Version, its correction of many errors, its numerous excellent renderings, its admirable paragraphing, and its extremely excellent type. But these merits should not blind us to its defects. We may admit that the work is good: but we cannot but lament that it is not a great deal better. We may acknowledge its many excellent renderings:

it is, nevertheless, our duty to point out its many departures from the true sense of the original.

Let me, at the outset, explain that I do not undertake, in this paper, to examine the renderings of the Old Testament given in "The Bible of 1911." That task I leave in the hands of Old Testament scholars. But I may, in passing, point out one or two blemishes which I have observed.

Genesis ix. 3a is thus rendered: "Every moving thing that liveth *shall be for you.*" There can be no doubt that it should read: "shall be *food* for you." The Hebrew word לֶאֱכֹלָה has no equivalent in the above rendering, but is left untranslated, thus quite obscuring the sense.

Is it not also a blemish that the fine poetical passage in the third chapter of the prophet Habakkuk should not be printed in poetical form? And that the word "Selah," which is certainly no part of the poem itself, should be allowed to disturb the rhythm of the composition, instead of being bracketed at the end of the line, as is done in the Revised Version?

One of the acknowledged excellences of "The Bible of 1911" is its method of paragraphing. It is the more strange, therefore, to find the postscript, "To the Chief Singer, on my stringed instruments," printed as if it were a part of this sublime ode—to the great injury of its effect when read in public (Hab. iii. 19).

I turn now to the New Testament; and here I regret to find many examples of erroneous translation, besides numerous failures to clear up the meaning of the text, which might have been done without marring the noble English of the Authorized Version, or destroying its familiar rhythm.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW.

Let me first take a few instances in the Gospel of St. Matthew which call for criticism:—

Matt. vi. 25a is identical with Luke xii. 22. In each case the Greek is *Μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ*. Yet the former is rendered, "Be not anxious concerning your life"; and the latter, "Take no anxious thought for your life."

Matt. vi. 27 is awkwardly (if not inaccurately) rendered, "*Who* of you by anxiety can add one cubit," instead of simply adding the word "anxious" to the Authorized Version and rendering, "*Which* of you by taking anxious thought can add one cubit?" There is a strange vacillation in the rendering of *μεριμνάω*. Sometimes it is translated, "Be not anxious," sometimes, "Take no anxious thought." How much simpler and more conservative of the English of the A. V. to leave Matt. vi. 34 unchanged, except by inserting "anxious," and read, "Take, therefore, no anxious thought for the morrow," instead of "Therefore, be not anxious concerning the morrow"!

In vii. 14 two different Greek words (*στενή* and *τεθλιμμένη*) are given the same rendering, "narrow." On the other hand, in ix. 6, 8, the same word (*ἐξουσίαν*) is rendered in the one verse "authority," and in the other "power,"—though the subject is precisely the same. Again, in x. 19 we have the following rendering: "Take no thought, how or what ye shall speak," though the same word (*μεριμνάω*) is used which elsewhere is rendered, "Take no anxious thought." This is a palpable blemish. Why is this correct meaning here put in the margin and in other places in the text? This shows that it was not an oversight and leaves the inaccuracy unaccounted for. A curious illustration of the lack of any fixed

principles in the revision is afforded by comparing Matt. vi. 27 with Luke xii. 25. The Greek of the two passages is exactly the same. Yet one is rendered, "Who of you"; the other, "which of you": one is rendered, "by anxiety"; the other, "with taking anxious thought": one is rendered, "can add one cubit unto his stature"; the other, "can add to his stature one cubit"; and a marginal reading is appended, "or, a span to his life." It does not appear why this marginal interpretation is not given in both places. A somewhat similar inconsistency occurs in x. 2, 3, where we find "James of Zebedee" in the second verse, but "James *the son of* Alphæus" in the third verse, though in each case the form is the same (ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου, ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου). In xiii. 5 we have "stony places," where the correct rendering, "rocky places," illuminates the meaning of the parable.

In xvii. 25 we have a flagrant error: "Jesus *went before him*, saying,"—where the word is *προέφθασεν*, and the correct rendering is, "*anticipated him*." (The A. R. V. renders rather awkwardly, but correctly, "Jesus spake first to him.")

In xxi. 19, 20, we find another instance of gratuitously giving different renderings to the same word. The dear old English Version reads: "And *immediately* the fig tree withered away," but "The Bible of 1911," professing to make only necessary changes, reads: "And *at once* the fig tree withered away." But the next verse swings back to the old rendering: "How is it that the fig tree *immediately* withered away?" In each case the word is *παραχρήμα*.

One of the distinctive excellences claimed for "The Bible of 1911" is "a system of chain references, specially prepared, . . . tracing through the whole Bible the greater themes of the Divine revelation from their first clear emergence to the final and complete form in the New Testa-

ment." Yet when we come, in Matt. xxii. 36 *seq.*, to the declaration by our Saviour of the great Law of Love, of God and of our neighbor, we find no references to the passages in Deuteronomy and Leviticus where that Law is first adumbrated. The reader might well suppose that it originated with this enunciation of it in the Gospels.

In xxiii. 24 we find "Strain out *the* gnat, and swallow a camel," though the definite article stands before each noun. The Greek of xxiv. 9 reads: "Then shall they deliver you up unto tribulation," but our new Bible changes the noun into a verb and reads: "deliver you up to be afflicted." This we set down as an unnecessary change both from the A. V. and from the Greek construction.

It is hardly correct to translate τῶν πολλῶν "the most" in xxiv. 12: rather, "the many."

Strange is it to find in xxv. 46 the word αἰώνιον given two different meanings in the same verse: "everlasting" and "eternal." Why perpetuate the error of the A. V.?

Passing to xxvi. 22, it is to be regretted that the opportunity has not been embraced of bringing out the fine distinction between the subjective and the objective negative, in translating the question of the distressed and astonished disciples when told that one of them should betray their Master. Μήτι ἐγώ εἰμι, Κύριε; should be rendered: "Surely it is not I, Lord?" This, which so well expresses the feelings of the faithful eleven, and which the guilty Judas (in ver. 25) repeats in his effort to feign innocence, is missed by both the A. V., the A. R. V., and now by the editors of "The Bible of 1911."

In xxvii. 3 it can hardly be doubted that the correct rendering is: "Judas . . . brought back the thirty pieces of silver," not "brought again"; and that in verse 6 "for"

should be omitted. Pilate's answer to the Jews (ver. 65) when they asked that the sepulcher be made sure, "Ye may have a guard," is as untrue to Greek grammar as it is to Roman idiom: *ἔχετε*, an indicative or an imperative, cannot properly be rendered, "Ye may have." And why have not the editors corrected the statement in xxviii. 16, that the eleven disciples "went away into Galilee *into* the mountain where Jesus had appointed them" (instead of "unto")? But, on the other hand, why have they not changed "baptizing in the name of the Father," etc., to "baptizing *into* the name," which is demanded by fidelity to the grammar and to the truth?

THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE.

In Luke i. 59 the significance of the imperfect *ἐκάλουν* is overlooked. It should be rendered: "They would have called him"—as the R. V. renders it.

In i. 63 the correct rendering is, "he asked for a writing *tablet*," not a "writing *table*."

In ix. 39, 42, "convulse" conveys the idea better than "tear."

In x. 1 "other seventy" is incorrect: it should be "seventy others."

In x. 30, 36, "robbers," not "thieves," is the true rendering.

In xi. 33, 34, 36, xii. 35, and xv. 8 we have the rendering "candle" where "lamp" should by all means be preferred. Archbishop Trench says: "*λύχνος* is not a candle. . . .but a hand lamp fed with oil; while *λαμπάς* is not a lamp at all, but a torch."¹ (In John v. 35 our editors, following the A. V., have obliterated the antithesis between Christ, the original and eternal *Light*, and John the Baptist, a *lamp* kindled by Christ.)

¹ Synonyms of the New Testament, p. 223.

In x. 51 we should have "between the altar and the sanctuary," not "temple," since the altar was within the temple precincts.

In xii. 23, 42, and elsewhere, our editors adhere to "meat" where modern usage requires "food." (So also in John iv. 32.)

In xii. 46 should not our editors have rendered "scourged severely" instead of "cut him asunder"? How could the wicked servant be assigned his portion with the unfaithful" if he had already been cut in two?¹

In xvii. 37, since the eagle is not a carrion bird, those interpreters of this and the corresponding word in St. Matthew are surely to be followed who render *ἀετός* here by "vultures," rather than "eagles."

In xix. 43 we have "Thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee," where it is clear that *χάραξ* can mean only "a rampart" or "a mound" in the well-known Roman manner.

In xxii. 35 we have the obsolete "scip," instead of "wallet."

In xxii. 65 "Blasphemously spake they against him" should be "spake they against him, reviling him."

In xxiii. 44 the darkness is said by the evangelist to have been "over all the *land*," and not "over all the *earth*."

THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.

It is to be regretted that the editors had not the courage to adopt in John i. 3, 4, the punctuation supported by the best ancient and modern authorities, and, putting the period after "made" in verse 3, to translate: "that which hath been made was life in him,"—a rendering which the A. R. V. places in the margin.

¹ See Thayer's New Testament Lexicon, s.v. *διχοτομέω*.

In i. 18 we read in the margin: "The Greek signifies to lead out, that is into visibility." This must be set down as one of the curiosities of exegesis: it is certainly without any lexical authority. The word is *ἐξηγήσατο*, and signifies simply "to declare," "to make manifest." The idea of visibility has no base lexically or textually.

In i. 41 we have "Messias," instead of "Messiah," although "Elias" has been correctly changed to "Elijah" in Matt. xvii. and xxvii.

In i. 46 the word "there" should be omitted, and the rendering be, "Can anything good come out of Nazareth?"

In vii. 17 we have "If any man doth do his will, he shall know of the doctrine"—a rendering which wholly misses the sense and is grammatically indefensible. It should be rendered, "if any man willeth [or is willing] to do his will, he shall know of the doctrine."

Incidentally we note a curious vacillation in the rendering of the two words *διδασκαλία* and *διδασκαλία*. The former is rendered here "doctrine"; in Matt. vii. 28, "teaching"; in Matt. xvi. 12, "doctrine"; and in Mark xi. 18, "teaching." In Mark i. 22 we have, "They were astonished at his doctrine," but in Matt. vii. 28, "They were astonished at his teaching," although in both cases the word is *διδασκαλία*. The rendering of *διδασκαλία* shows the same inconsistency. In Titus i. 9 it is rendered "teaching," in 1 Tim. iv. 1 and 2 Tim. iii. 16, "doctrine"; in 2 Tim. iv. 3, "teaching," and so on. If there is any difference in the meaning of the two words, this version fails to bring it out. It is curious to find it rendered in 2 Tim. ii. 10 by "teaching," and five verses farther on by "doctrine."

In John viii. 58 one wonders that our editors did not ren-

der this "before Abraham was born, I am," with Lightfoot, Westcott, and the Vulgate.

In xiii. 23-25 a delicate and significant touch is overlooked. The meaning conveyed by the original is that St. John was reclining on the bosom of his Master, and that he suddenly threw back his head upon his breast to ask a question. So Lightfoot and substantially the A. R. V.

ROMANS.

In Rom. i. 13 we find: "That I might have some fruit among you also, even as the rest of the Gentiles," where, evidently, it should read: "even as *among* the rest of the Gentiles"—a manifest oversight.

In ii. 20 what reason can be given for changing "the form of knowledge" into "the outline of knowledge"?

In v. 3 it is certainly unnecessary to change "until the law" to "prior to the law," as well as lexically incorrect.

In v. 15 *τοῦ ἐνός* occurs twice in this verse: it is rendered the first time "one"; the second time, "the one."

In v. 18 we have what cannot be called a felicitous, or even an accurate, rendering; but one awkward in the extreme, and untrue to the original. It is a paraphrase, and not a translation, and several words not in the Greek are supplied and not italicized: "Therefore, as in result one offense reached unto all men unto condemnation, even so the one righteous act reaches unto all unto justification of life." Meyer's rendering can hardly be improved upon: "As, therefore, *it has come to* a sentence of condemnation for all men through one trespass, so also *it has come to* justification of life for all men through one justifying judgment," or "one righteous act." The A. V. and the A. R. V. give substantially the

same sense. Winer¹ says: "Supply ἀπέβη impersonal: *res cessit*"; that is, "it has come to."

GALATIANS.

In Gal. i. 6, 7, note the failure to distinguish between ἔρεπον and ἄλλο. What St. Paul says is: "I marvel that ye are so quickly removing. . . unto a *different* gospel, which is not another." There is but *one* gospel: there cannot be *another*.

In ii. 21 we should have, not "Christ is *dead* in vain," but "*died* in vain."

In iii. 3 we should have, not "*evidently* set forth," but "*openly* set forth."

In iv. 8, instead of "did service," we should have "were in bondage."

In iv. 13 the meaning is, "Because of an infirmity of the flesh." This our editors have missed. The preposition here with the accusative cannot be rendered "through."

In iv. 24 "beareth children" is the clearest rendering; not "gendereth," which is obscure.

In vi. 17 "I bear branded on my body" is both picturesque and accurate, rather than "I bear in my body."

FIRST CORINTHIANS.

In 1 Cor. iii. 13 why change "carnal" to "fleshy"? In verse 9 why use the unfamiliar word "tillage" instead of "field"? In verse 10 why change "master builder" to "architect"? The latter word, in our usage, hardly expresses the idea of the apostle here.

In xi. 29 διακρίνων is correctly rendered, "if he discern not" (the Lord's body); but in verse 31 the same word is rendered, "judge." It should be, as Lightfoot says, "If we

¹Grammar of the New Testament, p. 587.

discerned ourselves, we should not have been judged." The distinction between *κρίνειν* and *διάκρινειν* does not seem to have been observed.

SECOND CORINTHIANS.

In 2 Cor. iv. 3 we have a serious error, "but if our gospel is veiled, it is veiled to them that *are lost*." It should be, "to them that *are perishing*" (present participle). It is curious to find the same words translated elsewhere (1 Cor. i. 18), "those that perish," not "those that are lost," as is done here.

In iv. 4 we have the "gospel of the glory" rendered "the glorious gospel"; as in Col. i. 11 we have "the might of his glory" rendered "his glorious power"; and Titus ii. 13, "the appearing of the glory," "the glorious appearing," and Phil. iii. 21, "the body of his glory" (antithesis of "our humiliation") rendered "glorified body." Again, in Rom. viii. 21 "the liberty of the glory" is rendered "glorious liberty," although in 2 Cor. iii. 11 this error is not committed.

In v. 10 St. Paul's impressive statement that "we must all *be made manifest* [that is, revealed in our true character] before the judgment seat of Christ" is given the weak and inaccurate rendering "we must all *appear*."

In v. 11 our editors retain "terror" as the rendering for *φόβος*, though "fear" is surely correct, and is the almost uniform rendering of the word in the A. V.

In vi. 2 are two errors. It should be, "At an acceptable time I hearkened unto thee," and again, "Now is the acceptable time." In verse 3 it should be, "that our *ministration* be not blamed," instead of the obscure "that the *service* be not blamed." In verse 4 why change "ministers of God" into "God's servants"?

FIRST TIMOTHY.

In 1 Tim. i. 3 we should have "exhorted thee to tarry." St. Paul would not "beseech" Timothy to tarry. And the second clause should be rendered, not "when I went into Macedonia," but "when I was on my way to Macedonia."

In i. 4 our editors have missed the sense of *αἰτιῶν*. It should be "seeing that," or "inasmuch as," "they minister questionings." At the end of the verse it is necessary, in order to complete the sense, to supply the words "so I do now" (to correspond with "As I besought," in verse 3), which our editors have quite omitted.

In i. 6 "babbling" would surely be a more intelligible word than "jangling."

In i. 7 the significance of *μη νοοῦντες* has apparently been overlooked by our editors. The rendering should be "though they understand neither what they say," etc.

In ii. 7 "I have been appointed a preacher" should be "I was appointed a preacher." It is the aorist, not the perfect.

In ii. 9 we have "not with pleatings." Why employ so unusual a word when the correct rendering, "braided hair," is at hand?

In iv. 10 "we hope in a living God" (a violation of tense) should be "we have set our hope upon the living God."

In v. 9 we have the awkward rendering "Let a widow be put on the list not under three score years old." How much better is the rendering of the A. R. V., "Let none be enrolled as a widow under three score years old"!

In v. 18 we find "the labourer is worthy of his *reward*," where "*hire*" is surely a better rendering." In fact, the primary meaning of the Greek is "dues paid for work," "wages."

In iii. 16 it is to be regretted that our editors did not recognize the fact that in this verse the word "God" ($\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$) rests on no sufficient ancient MS. evidence. It is also to be regretted that they have not recognized the rhythmical character of this verse. We can hardly doubt that it is a quotation from some Christian hymn. The correct translation would seem to be indicated thus: "Great is the mystery of godliness in him, who ($\delta\varsigma$)

"Was manifest in the flesh,
Was justified in the spirit,
Was seen of angels,
Was preached among the Gentiles,
Was believed on in the world,
Was received up into glory."

In v. 21 we have, "observe these things without *prejudgment*," which is an awkward expression, and not a true interpretation of the Greek. "Without *prejudice*" is surely more accurate, and corresponds with "partiality" in the next clause.

In v. 24 we have "some men's sins are open beforehand," which is an obscure rendering, the meaning being "are openly manifest."

In vi. 5 our editors have repeated the serious error of the A. V. (mistaking the subject for the predicate, and quite misrepresenting St. Paul's idea), "supposing that gain is godliness." The true rendering—and this we supposed was universally acknowledged by scholars—is, "supposing that godliness is gain," that is, a source of gain. Verse 6 makes the apostle's idea perfectly plain, where he says, "but godliness with contentment is great gain." It may be confidently said that no one ever supposed that gain was godliness, while multitudes have acted upon the idea that godliness was a source of gain.

In vi. 10 our editors have corrected in part the error of the A. V., which makes St. Paul assert what is not true, viz. that "the love of money is the root of all evil." They render it "the love of money is a root of all evils," which it must be said is not clear. How much better to have rendered it "the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil"!

In vi. 12 we have again a confusion of tenses. It should be rendered "whereunto thou wast called and didst confess the good confession."

In vi. 18 the rendering of *κοινωνικούς* given by the A. R. V., "ready to sympathize," is surely preferable. And to retain in verse 20 the rendering of the A. V., "science" (for *γνώσις*) is to convey a quite erroneous meaning.

SECOND TIMOTHY.

In 2 Tim. ii. 4 the aorist is again rendered as the perfect. The last clause of verse 5 certainly means "yet is he not crowned except he has contended lawfully." Why paraphrase this by rendering "hath not observed the rules"?

In ii. 11-13, is not the rhythmical character of the passage unmistakable, and should it not have been arranged in poetic form as probably a quotation from a Christian hymn?

In verse 16 our editors adhere to the awkward rendering of the A. V., viz. "they will increase unto more ungodliness."

In iv. 3, in the second clause, our editors have lost the opportunity of clearing up the meaning by failing to place the words "having itching ears" at the beginning of the clause, and rendering "but, having itching ears, they heaped to themselves teachers after their own lusts." It is not meant that the *teachers* had itching ears!

In the great passage, 2 Tim. iii. 16, our editors have adhered to the rendering of the A. V., viz. "all scripture is

given by inspiration of God, and is profitable," etc. One can only regret that they did not yield to the overwhelming weight of scholarship, and render: "every scripture inspired of God is also profitable," etc. It is strange that, after having correctly rendered (Eph. iii. 15) *πᾶσα πατριά*, "every family," they should not have rendered here *πᾶσα γραφή*, "every scripture."

USE OF VERBS.

Let me now point out one or two errors in the use of verbs.

First, we have the perfect confounded with the present, as in Rom. v. 5, where the perfect tense is rendered by a present. Can we doubt that it should be, "the love of God *hath been shed abroad* in our hearts"?

On the other hand, we have a failure to observe the distinction between the aorist and the perfect, as in Matt. xxv. 24, where the Greek should be rendered "reaping where thou *didst not* sow, and gathering where thou *didst not* scatter."

So also Col. ii. 11, 12, where we find "*have been* circumcised," instead of "*were* circumcised"; and "*have been* raised," instead of "*were* raised."

Again, we find the same error in Rom. vi. 17 and 19, yet our editors have well observed the distinction in many other places; as, in Rom. v. 12, vi. 2, 4, 6, 8, vii. 4; 2 Cor. v. 14; Acts xix. 2.

Let me now point out one or two instances in which the substitution of the past tense for the present has seriously marred the significance of the original.

In Heb. ix. 6-8 the sacred writer gives a description of the rites and sacrifices connected with the temple worship in these words (according to the true rendering): "Now these things having been thus prepared, the priests *go in* continually

into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God; but into the second the high priest (goeth) alone, not without blood which he *offereth* for himself and for the errors of the people, the Holy Ghost thus signifying that the way into the holy place hath not yet been made manifest while the first tabernacle is yet standing; which is a figure for the time present according to which *are offered* both gifts and sacrifices." Now this language plainly implies *that the temple was still standing*, and that the ordinances of the Jewish ritual were still in operation at the time that this Epistle was written.

King James' translators, however, by substituting the past for the present tense in all these verses, completely changed the point of view and deprived the reader of a valuable suggestion as to the date of the Epistle. Unfortunately, the editors of "The Bible of 1911" have followed closely in their footsteps in thus doing violence to the meaning of the tenses in the original. The plain inference from this passage as it stands in their version is, that the writer was looking back upon a temple service which no longer existed, and thus the reader will naturally infer that the Epistle was written after the destruction of Jerusalem, rather than before it.

I give next an example of the mistranslation of the present infinitive. In Matt. viii. 24 we read that "the boat was covered with the waves," where the true rendering is "the boat began to be covered by the waves." In the parallel passage (Mark iv. 37), our editors have avoided this error. Again, we have a violation of tense, where in Heb. ii. 16 the present is rendered by the preterite twice in the same verse.

Again, in Heb. xi. 17 the imperfect is confounded with the preterite. The true rendering in the second clause of the verse is, "he who had received the promises was offering up," i. e. "was about to offer up," his only begotten son.

We observe also errors in the rendering of the aorist participle. Thus Acts xxi. 5, 6, is rendered, "We kneeled down on the shore and prayed. And when we had taken our leave one of another, we took ship," which is not the idea conveyed by the Greek. It should rather be thus: "And, kneeling down on the shore, we prayed, and bade each other farewell."

So, also, Luke xxiii. 46 should be rendered, "and, crying with a loud voice, Jesus said." The A. V. and "The Bible of 1911" give quite a wrong impression, viz. that Jesus first cried with a loud voice and then said; whereas the true meaning is, that the words of his cry were uttered with a loud voice.

Again, in Acts v. 30 we have a similar error. The rendering of "The Bible of 1911," "Whom ye slew and hanged on a tree," implies that Jesus was first slain, and then hanged on a tree. The Greek, however, expresses the idea that he was slain by hanging on a tree.

TEXTUAL ERRORS.

Attention may next be called to one or two textual errors.

In Rom. iv. 19, in the clause "he considered not," the word "not" should be omitted: it is an erroneous reading, and makes St. Paul contradict the record of Gen. xvii. 17. (See the rendering of ver. 19, 20, in the A. R. V.)

In 2 Tim. iv. 14 the correct text yields the sense "Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil, the Lord *will reward him* according to his work." Our present text imputes to St. Paul a rather vindictive spirit, "*the Lord reward him according to his works!*" Why put the correct reading in the margin?

Another textual emendation has been overlooked by our

editors. In Matt. vi. 12 the correct reading is, I think, acknowledged to be *αφήκαμεν*, which gives the sense "forgive us our debts *as we have forgiven* our debtors."

THE ARTICLE, ETC.

Let me next give one or two examples of erroneous rendering of the article.

Luke iv. 9 should read, not "*a* pinnacle of the temple," but "*the* pinnacle of *the* temple": there was but one.

In Luke vii. 3 the definite article is again erroneously rendered by the indefinite, "a synagogue." The true rendering is, "Himself built us our synagogue."

In several places we have "*a* mountain" where it should be "*the* mountain"; "*a* ship" where it should be "*the* ship" or "*the* boat."

I may call attention to an archaism which has been overlooked.

In Mark vi. 25 the daughter of Herodias asks that the head of John the Baptist may be given her "on a *charger*." In modern usage the charger signifies a war horse. The word should be rendered "on a *platter*."

In John v. 35 our Lord is made to say that John was "a burning and shining light." The Greek really signifies that he was "the *lamp* that was burning and shining," which brings out the important distinction between Jesus and John. Jesus, only, was "the Light of the World."

Several other errors, taken almost at random from different books, may be pointed out.

In Luke iii. 23 our editors repeat the inadmissible rendering given by the A. V., viz. "Jesus himself began to be

about thirty years of age," where the true rendering is "Jesus himself when he began (*to teach*) was about thirty years of age."

In Luke xvii. 20 we have the strange rendering, "the kingdom of God cometh not with outward show." The Greek word is *παρατήρησις*, which signifies "observation"; and what our Saviour doubtless meant was, "the kingdom of God cometh not with observation," that is, "in such manner that it can be watched with the eyes."

In Heb. v. 12 our editors have adhered to the erroneous rendering of the A. V., and translated, "when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you." This is a failure to observe the meaning of *διὰ* with the accusative. It should have been rendered, "by reason of the long time (of their training)."

In Rev. i. 15 we have an example of the same word given two different meanings in the same clause. They render "his voice as the *sound* of many waters." Surely there is no reason for this. "His voice as the *voice* of many waters" is the natural and correct rendering. In each case it is *φῶνη*.

In Heb. iii. 11 and iv. 3 we have identically the same words differently rendered. In the first case, "so I swear in my wrath, 'they shall not enter into my rest'"; in the second, "as I have sworn in my wrath, 'they shall not enter into my rest.'" In the one the aorist is recognized and correctly rendered; in the other it is transformed into a perfect.

In iii. 11 *ὥς* is rendered "so"; and in iv. 13, it is rendered "as."

In Rom. xii. 19 and Heb. x. 30 we have the following words: 'Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, — (identical in each case); but in the former case the rendering is, "vengeance is mine, I will repay." In the latter, "vengeance belongeth unto

me, I will recompense." While the meaning of the two renderings is the same, what good reason can be given for not rendering them by the same words?

In 1 Cor. xvi. 22 we have in the margin "Greek Maranatha," and this is given as an interpretation of the English word "accursed" in the text; whereas it is, in fact, the equivalent of the words "Our Lord cometh." This is evidently a slip, indicative of the haste with which "The Bible of 1911" was prepared.

Thus the errors which demanded a revision in 1880 have been repeated in 1911.

The examination to which, in the preceding pages, I have subjected "The Bible of 1911" does not pretend to be exhaustive. I have taken from different parts of the New Testament, only a few instances (out of many) of errors in the volume; enough, however, to justify the criticism which I have undertaken. I have not been able to resist the reluctant opinion that, on the whole, the verdict upon this enterprise must finally be that a great opportunity has been lost; for, while a faithful attempt has been made to conserve the dignity and the rhythm of the Authorized Version, and while many blemishes in that noble work have, in this one, been corrected; still, so many errors have been allowed to remain, and so many mistakes have been committed in the revision, that the judgment of the best scholarship must, I think, finally be that the admirable program laid down at the inception of this undertaking has not been carried out with anything like the success which might have been anticipated. The reason for the failure, if failure it is, is, I think, not far to seek. It is found in the fact that too little time was given

to the work; such an enterprise should have occupied at least four or five years, instead of nine months. It is far from my intention to call in question the scholarship of the editors; but I do question the method which was pursued, the haste with which the work was done, and, above all, the imposition upon the editor-in-chief of an amount of work which no one scholar, however accomplished, could possibly achieve in the brief space that was allowed for the task.