

*THE REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW
TESTAMENT.*

II. THE TRANSLATION.

(1) THE RENDERING OF GREEK WORDS.

THE heading of this paper sufficiently indicates its scope ; except that I shall not now discuss the rendering of Greek particles, which, together with the rendering of Greek inflexions and syntax, I reserve for another paper.

The task thus undertaken is one from which the boldest writer may well recoil. We have been told by the very learned chairman of the New Testament Company of Revisers, that their work has been gone over seven times. And we all know that in the Company are some of the ablest living New Testament scholars. Surely such care and such scholarship ought to disarm all criticism. But in spite of it the New Version is attacked all round. I am sure that Dr. Ellicott will not deny me the right and the pleasure of saying a few words in its defence. And while doing so I cannot forbear to point out, with the respect due to its authors, what seem to me to be defects in a work which as a whole I heartily commend.

In estimating the great work now before us we must ever bear in mind that an English Version is needed chiefly by those not familiar with the original language of the New Testament, that is to say, by the mass of the nation, to whom the version they use is practically the voice of Evangelists and Apostles. Consequently, to reproduce as correctly and clearly and fully as possible the sense which these men of days gone by designed their words to convey, must be the first aim of all translators and revisers. Keeping this ever in view as of chief importance, their second aim must be to make their rendering as beautiful and appropriate as they can.

In this paper I shall mention first several new renderings which are an indisputable gain. I shall then consider some Greek words which present to the translator special difficulty, and the way in which the Revisers have endeavoured to surmount the difficulty. Lastly, I shall discuss a few renderings which I cannot approve.

A conspicuous improvement in the New Version is that, to a much larger extent than before, one Greek word is represented by one English equivalent. This is much more than a matter of mere literary propriety. Very often in the Authorised Version an historical coincidence or a train of argument is obscured by a needless change in rendering some important word.

As an instance of gain in this matter I may mention the word *robber*, which in the New Version is the constant equivalent of *ληστής*. Whatever the words meant in an earlier day, with us a *robber* is one who plunders with open violence, while the *thief* steals with secret guile. And this is the exact distinction of the Greek words so rendered. The change gives vividness to every passage in which it is made. How greatly it increases the force of the Saviour's words in St. Matthew xxi. 13, *Ye make it a den of robbers*; and in Chapter xxvi. 55, *Are ye come out as against a robber with swords and staves to seize me?* The new rendering of St. Matthew xxvii. 38 recalls at once the famous¹ *robber* Barabbas,² who with his companions in violence and murder³ lay that morning in prison. Of this robber band, *one* man, Barabbas, doubtless the chief, was set free. And, that on the same day two robbers were crucified, suggests at once that these were his companions in violence and bloodshed.

The new rendering *creation* in Romans viii. 20, 21, replacing the unintelligible word *creature*, not only gives a clear, and I believe correct, sense, but reveals the con-

¹ Verse 16.

² St. John xviii. 40.

³ St. Mark xv. 7.

nexion of these Verses with Verse 22, thus elucidating the Apostle's argument. The meaning of the word will be still more clear if, as I doubt not, in the Revised Apocrypha the same rendering of the same word is adopted in Wisdom v. 17; xvi. 24; xix. 6.

In Romans vii. 7, 8, the rendering *covet* three times, instead of *lust*, *covet*, and *concupiscence*, both restores a line of argument completely broken in the Old Version and makes the Apostle's reference to the Tenth Commandment more conspicuous.

In rendering this last word, uniformity might have been carried much further and with great gain, by using the word *desire* for ἐπιθυμία always; as frequently the Revisers have been compelled to do. Neither the Greek word nor its Hebrew¹ equivalent implies in itself bad desire; much less sensual desire, the modern meaning of the English word *lust* when not otherwise defined. That the Greek word is morally neutral, we learn at once from St. Matthew xiii. 17; St. Luke xvii. 22; xxii. 15; Acts xx. 33; 1 Timothy iii. 1; Hebrews vi. 11; 1 Peter i. 12; Philippians i. 23; Colossians iii. 5; 1 Thessalonians ii. 17. Even in the Tenth Commandment not all *desire* is forbidden, but to desire our neighbour's wife and goods. The impropriety of the rendering *lust*, which is everywhere retained by the Revisers, is very conspicuous in Galatians v. 17; where, if their words give any meaning, they attribute *lust* to the Holy Spirit. If long established usage had deterred the Committee from using the word *desire* in the Tenth Commandment, they might have used it everywhere else; and here have given the true meaning in the margin.

In not a few cases, reasons still more important than those illustrated by the foregoing examples, demand imperatively uniformity of rendering. Into many Greek words the Gospel breathed a new and higher life and a deeper signifi-

¹ Compare Psalm lxxviii. 16.

cance, thus making them embodiments of the new thoughts given to humanity by the creative Spirit of Christ. And, that this new significance may be felt, it is of infinite importance that, so far as possible, each consecrated Greek word should have a constant English equivalent. For each passage in which the word occurs contributes to reveal the breadth and depth of its new meaning.

Uniformity of rendering is a gain even to those who do not consciously take any interest in the meaning of words. For, by the innate constitution of the human mind, and from childhood, we are all philologists. Without knowing it, we gather the meaning of words instinctively from the various objects to which each word is applied. And these meanings are an important element in the development of our thought. Similarly, from the use of words in the Bible the careful reader gathers their significance, and thus imbibes the truths embodied in them. Hence a correct and full reproduction, by means of uniform English equivalents, of the Greek words of the New Testament is a gain to all who read an English version.

Of all the conceptions conveyed by the Gospel, or known to men, the noblest is that embodied in the Greek word *ἀγάπη*; a word unknown, as its significance was unknown, in classic literature. In a few places, oftener of things than men, its cognate verb is found. In the Septuagint the verb is frequent, the substantive very rare. The word *ἀγάπη* has the unique honour of being the only substantive noting a moral attribute which is predicated, simply and without explanation or limitation, of God Himself: for *God is Love*. Now in his beautiful Psalm of Love¹ St. Paul teaches that this unique attribute of God, noted by this one word which is itself a sufficient description of the moral nature of God, is also the one moral quality which is itself all we need to be. In other words, human excellence is

¹ 1 Corinthians xiii.

not, as many think it is, composite ; but, like all great principles, absolutely simple. All this the Apostle makes us feel by portraying a man in whom are accumulated all sorts of supposed excellences and merits, but who is destitute of this one quality which is the moral essence of God ; and by portraying side by side of him a man whose whole being is an impersonation of love. The one portrait we recognise at once, without asking a question about ability or achievements, as the most perfect model of human excellence we have seen. From the other we turn with disgust as utterly worthless.

All this is obscured, and from very many readers utterly hidden, by the unfortunate rendering in the Authorised Version. It is vain to say that every one knows that *charity* means *love*. This is not true. Again and again I have heard this Chapter quoted as though the word *charity* was there used in one or other of its various modern senses. Moreover, we need to be ever reminded of that which we know. And nothing brings a conception home to us with ever increasing force more than its embodiment in a familiar word. For even the words we use are constantly moulding our thoughts. It is hardly too much to say that the Authorised rendering has ruined the significance of this beautiful Chapter.

Even more wretched is the old rendering of Romans xiv. 15, where St. Paul takes up his important teaching in Chapter xiii. 8-10, viz., that *Love is a fulfilment of Law*, and brings it to bear on the matter of the weak brethren.

Yet some have complained because the Revisers have restored the harmony of New Testament teaching, by using a uniform rendering for this all-important Greek word. The only reason I can hear is that *charity* has three syllables, and thus produces a more pleasant rhythm. Rather let all rhythm, or even all literary beauty, perish

than ever so little obscure the moral beauty and the divine origin of this noblest grace of the Christian life.

The reasons which demand that a Greek word have if practicable the same English reading everywhere make it desirable that cognates also preserve the family likeness. In this respect the New Version is much better than the Old. And this is the reason of not a few of the apparently small and needless changes of which some critics complain so much. A good example is the alteration in 2 Corinthians iii. 18 of *changed* into *transformed*, which recalls not only the same word and same tense in Romans xii. 2, but places these passages in connexion with Romans viii. 29 and Philippians iii. 10, 21, thus revealing a brilliant galaxy of New Testament gems.

I cannot easily forgive the Revisers for leaving outside the field of their telescope the one remaining star of the galaxy, by using another rendering in St. Matthew xvii. 2 and St. Mark ix. 2. If they were afraid to disturb the familiar associations of the Transfiguration, they might at least have put the right word in the margin.

Uniformity of spelling proper names in the Old and New Testaments is a most excellent feature of the New Version. To thousands of readers the Old Version of Acts vii. 45 and Hebrews iv. 8 is altogether meaningless, whereas now not only is the meaning quite clear but the margin tells us that the name of the Divine Deliverer was borne centuries before his birth by the victorious leader of Israel. I am quite sure that multitudes do not know, especially in passages such as St. Matthew xi. 14; xvi. 14, that *Elias* and *Elijah* are the same name. *Eliseus*, in St. Luke iv. 27, is equally perplexing. It will be said that these people are very ignorant. But many of them love the Bible. And it is for such as these that translations of it are made.

In St. Matthew i. 5, the change from *Rachab* to *Rahab* sheds beautiful light upon the later history of the harlot

of Jericho, and presents an interesting coincidence with Joshua vi. 25. By spelling the name exactly as in Hebrews xi. 31, James ii. 25, the New Version goes a little beyond the Greek text. But this only proves that the translator is sometimes compelled to decide matters which seem to lie outside his own province. In this case I doubt not that the decision is correct.

The mutual relations of the teaching of the Old and New Testaments, one of the most important elements of theology, is frequently made clear in the New Version by the use of one English equivalent for a Hebrew word and its Greek equivalent. This extension of uniformity of rendering is required by all the reasons for uniformity given above. To estimate its full effect we must wait till we have the Revised Old Testament. But the great gain of it is already apparent.

As an example of this gain I may mention the new rendering of the great word *διαθήκη*. There was here much need for amendment. For, in many important passages, such as 1 Corinthians xi. 25, the old rendering gives no meaning whatever, and hides altogether the interesting coincidence of Exodus xxiv. 8. But a correct rendering of this word is by no means easy. For we have no one English equivalent which covers, even approximately, the ground occupied by the Greek word. Moreover, the use of it by the Seventy as their constant Greek equivalent of *ברית* differs from its ordinary classic use. A good classic example, however, of the Septuagint use is found in line 440 of the *Birds* of Aristophanes: *ἦν μὴ διάθωνται γ' οἷδε διαθήκην ἐμοὶ ἤνπερ ὁ πίθηκος τῇ γυναικὶ διέθετο*. The difficulty of the translators is increased by the occurrence of the word in Hebrews ix. 16, 17, in its usual classic meaning of *testamentary deed*, in close connection with the Old Testament associations of the word. The difficulties thus presented, the Revisers have surmounted as well as our own

language permits, by using the rendering *covenant* everywhere else, and by putting it in the margin in Hebrews ix. 16, 17 and the word *testament* in the text. The gain of this alteration, as elucidating the dealings of God with man during the long ages covered by the Sacred Writings, cannot be over-estimated.

Even the rendering *Holy of Holies*, in Hebrews ix. 3, is not without value to many readers.

Probably no word in the Old Version is more staggering to the ordinary reader than the ugly rendering *beast* in Revelation iv. and v. And it is much worse than ugly and inappropriate. For it obscures the plain reference to Ezekiel i. 5ff., which reveals at once at the opening of the visions of the Book of Revelation their close connexion with the visions of Ezekiel. This connexion is maintained throughout both books, as may be seen by comparing the descriptions of the fall of Tyre in Ezekiel xxvi.–xxviii., of Gog and Magog in Chapters xxxviii., xxxix., and of the New Jerusalem in the concluding Chapters, with familiar passages in the Book of Revelation. This relationship of these Old and New Testament Apocalypses is, I believe, the best key to unlock the hidden meaning of both. And it is suggested at once by the revised rendering *Living Creatures*.

Moreover, Ezekiel tells us in Chapter x. 15, 20 that the *Living Creatures* he saw are the Cherubim. He thus connects the visions of himself and of John with all the Old Testament teaching about the Cherubim, and so sheds light upon one of the most mysterious subjects in the Bible.

On the other hand, the old rendering, *beast*, suggests a false connexion with Revelation xiii., where a totally different word is used, recalling Daniel vii. 3ff. and an altogether different cycle of Apocalyptic visions.

The reader will judge how great is the gain of the revised rendering of this one Greek word.

Many references in the New Testament to the Old Testament the Revisers have done something to make more clear by extending their uniformity of rendering to cognate words. A good example of this is found in 2 Corinthians iii. 13-iv. 6, where *Moses' veil*, as the story is told in Exodus xxxiv. 29-35, is a beautiful Old Testament thread inwoven throughout, and binding the whole together. This interesting connexion, which is quite obscured by the old rendering of Chapter iii. 18 and Chapter iv. 3, is brought out into clear light by the *unveiled face* and the *veiled Gospel* of the New Version.

All the alterations noted above flow from the principle of giving to Greek words, as far as possible, a uniform English dress. And this uniformity is itself, as we have seen, an abundant recompense for the cost and toil of revision. But it is by no means the only gain. Frequently a more exact or more intelligible equivalent is found for a Greek word. And in some cases the improvement is of practical importance. Of this I will give a few examples.

The word *games* in 1 Corinthians ix. 25 and 2 Timothy ii. 5 not only gives sense to a sentence which before was senseless but brings out into clearer light a favourite metaphor of which St. Paul makes frequent use to convey important practical teaching. The word *secret* in Philipians iv. 12, is also a great gain. But I wish that in a marginal note reference had been made to the cognate word *mystery*. These words are, in my view, an allusion to the ancient mysteries, such as those which made Eleusis famous. And the allusion embodies teaching of infinite importance. The Christian believer is brought into the secret chamber of God, and taught there truths known only by those to whom they have been revealed by the Spirit of God. This is the express teaching of 1 Corinthians ii. 6-16.

The word *lamp* in St. Matthew v. 15, has no small theological import. It recalls at once the earthenware lamps

found at Pompeii and elsewhere. Like these, we are but dust of the earth; and of ourselves as dark and as cold as the clay beneath our feet. But we are capable of being filled with and containing divine oil, even the Spirit of God, and of being lighted with fire from heaven. And, like lamps, for this end we were made. This beautiful analogy is obscured by the old rendering *candle*. I may, however, suggest that *lamp-stand* would be a better rendering of *λυχνία* than the neutral word *stand*. Even the similarity of sound of *lamp* and *lamp-stand* suggests that the one was designed for the other.

The word *bowl* instead of *vial* in Revelation xvi. will probably distress some lovers of the Old Version. But every one knows what a bowl is: which is more than can be said for *vial*.

The antiquated word just mentioned suggests another class of emendations in the New Version, viz., those in which obsolete and now unmeaning terms are displaced by such as all can understand. But even more important than this is the removal of old words which are still current and common in a new and quite different sense. It is better that a version give no sense at all rather than a wrong one.

The changed usage of the word *conversation* has obscured altogether the meaning of 1 Peter i. 15, 18; ii. 12; iii. 1, 2, 16, and other passages. The revised rendering of all these is an evident gain. But I regret that the root idea is not in some way associated with the verb in 1 Peter i. 17. I venture to suggest that the rendering *behaviour*, adopted in Chapters ii. 12 and iii. 1, 2, might have been maintained throughout. It is the more valuable because it has a cognate verb, *to behave oneself*. We should then read *holy in all behaviour: behave yourselves with fear during the time of your sojourning: your vain behaviour: and in iii. 16, your good behaviour in Christ*. In any case the connexion should have been noted in the margin.

A far more serious change of significance, obscuring many passages, and giving to others a wrong and sometimes dangerous sense, is found in the Authorised rendering of *σκάνδαλον, σκανδαλίζειν*. The Authorised Version renders these words nearly always *offence, offend*; in the sense of *strike the foot against* or *stumble, that against which one strikes his foot*. But this meaning is now displaced by that of *vex* or *annoy*, and in this sense the words are very common. This change gives to very many passages in the Authorised Version a meaning utterly wrong and even dangerous. This danger is completely removed in the Revised Version.

At the same time I do not think the Revisers have given the true sense of these words. Their derivation (the words themselves are not found in classic Greek) suggests at once the meaning *snare, ensnare*. And this is confirmed by a metaphorical use of the classic form of the word in line 687 of the *Acharnians* of Aristophanes: *σκανδάληθρ' ιστῆς ἐπῶν*. The meaning I suggest accords with, and gives great significance to, all the passages in the New Testament in which the word is found, and accords on the whole with the use of the words in the Septuagint and Apocrypha. It also retains the word *stumble* for *προσκόπτω* and *πρόσκομμα*.

As illustrations of the above, I may quote the following. In St. Matthew v. 29 f.; xviii. 8 f., we are bidden by Christ to cast away, not a bodily member which vexes, but one that ensnares, us. To the men referred to in St. Matthew xiii. 21 persecution was a trap in which they were caught. St. Matthew xi. 6 suggests that in the action or circumstances even of Christ there was something which, to some men, might prove a snare. In St. Matthew xviii. 6, Christ refers not to those who vex, but those who ensnare, and thus injure or destroy, his little ones (compare also St. Matthew xvii. 27). And 1 John ii. 10 suggests that he who hates his brother carries *within him* a snare in which he

will be himself caught. The removal of the word *offend* from these passages is an immense gain.

But I do not like at all the new renderings, *stumbling block, occasions of stumbling, cause to stumble*. These renderings certainly depart from the etymological meaning of the word, which seems to me to be always present. And by confounding it with *προσκόπτω, πρόσκομμα*, they reduce to tautology Romans ix. 33; xiv. 13; 1 Peter ii. 8.

In my *Commentary on Romans* I have adopted the rendering *snare*, which is the more suitable because of its cognate verb *ensnare*. And I believe that this rendering might be adopted throughout the New Testament. The most difficult combination, *rock of a snare*, has some meaning. For the collocation of *rock* and *snare* suggests a rock on which those who step are caught as in a trap. And this is the sense suggested by the Greek words. Whereas, to most readers, the rendering retained by the Revisers, *rock of offence*, has no meaning whatever.

Not a few words of the Greek Testament are specially difficult to translate because we have no English word which awakens the same ideas and associations of ideas as does the Greek word. And some of these words are of great practical importance.

The word *τέλειος* denotes that which has reached its *τέλος* or goal, which has achieved or is achieving the aim of its existence. It denotes that which is full-grown, as distinguished from that of which the development is incomplete. What the English word *perfect* means, it is very difficult to say. But the idea of growth is no part of its connotation; and it frequently suggests the idea of a completeness which has no flaw and admits of no further progress. For these reasons it is a most undesirable rendering of a word frequently predicated of men on earth. The words *full-grown* or *mature*, and, for the verb, *bring to maturity*, are perhaps the best English equivalents. But,

in any case, the oneness of the idea embodied in this one important word demands one rendering in the text or the margin.

To say that the revised rendering of this word is very defective, is only to say that of which probably every member of the Committee is already conscious. Words like this make us feel how poorly even the best translations reproduce the thoughts and modes of thought of ancient writers. In most cases the Revisers have left unchanged the objectionable word *perfect*, even when used of men. In a few cases, *e.g.*, Ephesians iv. 13, Hebrews v. 14, they have done well by substituting for it the rendering *full-grown*. In 1 Corinthians ii. 6, the same rendering is put in the margin. In 1 Corinthians xiv. 20, we have the rendering *men*. These are undeniable improvements. It would, however, have been preferable to put the word *perfect*, if used elsewhere, in the margin of Ephesians iv. 13, as has been done in Hebrews v. 14; and to keep up the association of thought by putting the word *full-grown* in either the text or margin of Philippians iii. 15; Colossians i. 28; iv. 12; James iii. 2. But on the whole no one can deny that the new rendering is better than that of the Authorised Version.

Another word for which we have no English equivalent, but of which the Greek sense is uniform and clearly defined, is *ἐξουσία*. The meaning of it, I have already endeavoured to expound in this Journal.¹ The new rendering, *authority*, in 1 Corinthians xi. 10 is a great gain, as is *right* in 1 Corinthians ix. 4-12. But why this latter rendering is not extended to 1 Corinthians viii. 9 (compare ix. 18), or at least put in the margin, I do not know.

Very difficult to render is *ὑπομονή*; the more so because of the grandeur of the Christian virtue therein embodied, and because we need for its corresponding verb an English representative which will at once reveal the relationship.

¹ First Series, vol. xi. p. 27.

Except in two passages¹ from the most classic writer of the New Testament, where the verb has the good classic sense of *remain behind*, these words denote *continuing under*, combining the ideas of pressure and of continuance in spite of it. They combine the sense of our words *endurance* and *perseverance*, nouns which fortunately have corresponding verbs. The antithesis of *ὑπομένω* is *φείγω*. The hardships and perils which beset the path of the early Christians, threatening to drive them back from the way of life, give to these words in the New Testament a very deep significance.

In the Authorised Version the substantive *ὑπομονή* is nearly always rendered *patience*; the verb is rendered *endure*, except in Romans xii. 12; 1 Peter ii. 20, and the passages noted above. This divided rendering weakens very much the significance of these grand words. And it leaves unnoticed the important element of *perseverance* which is ever present in them. Instead of the noble conception of going forward in face of foes who would drive us back, the rendering *patience* suggests to most Englishmen the sense of not losing one's temper. These great defects of the Authorised Version the Revisers have done nothing to correct; except that in James v. 11 the word *endurance* is put in the margin. Much better would it have been to put either *endurance* or *perseverance* in the text according as the idea of hardship or that of continuance was more prominent, and the other in the margin. This is a case in which the margin may do very much to supply the necessary defects of even the best translation.

Very much more difficult, and still more important, is the English rendering of the word *ψυχικός*. It is important because of the light which this adjective sheds on the exact meaning of the word rendered *soul*. It is extremely difficult because our language has no adjective at all akin to the substantive *soul*. The all-important task

¹ St. Luke ii. 43; Acts xvii. 14.

of reproducing the relation of *ψυχή* and *ψυχικός*, both the Authorised and the Revised Versions give up in utter despair. They thus permit the important argument of 1 Corinthians xv. 44-46 to remain absolutely unintelligible. The Revisers might have found some relief by putting in the margin against *ψυχικός* wherever found some such rendering as *soul-governed*. Clumsy as this may appear, it would at least keep up the connexion with the word *soul*. They have, however, done well in restoring *soul* in Ephesians vi. 6; Philippians i. 27. The significance of this correction is greater than at first sight appears. I am exceedingly curious to see how the Old Testament Company will treat the corresponding Hebrew word.

I must now pass to a few words for which, without any special difficulty, the Revisers have retained renderings which I think they ought to have changed.

The Revisers have, in my view, done well by retaining the general archaic tone of the Authorised Version. But where the Old Version uses two synonymous words, of which one gives to modern Englishmen a clear sense and the other is almost unintelligible, we ought to have in a Version designed for all sorts and conditions of men only the word which all can understand. I cannot see why the word *purge* as a rendering of *καθαίρω* is allowed to remain in 1 Corinthians v. 7 and 2 Timothy ii. 21, while in St. Matthew iii. 12; St. John xv. 2; Hebrews ix. 14, it is displaced by the very clear and good word *cleanse*.

The word *suffer* in St. Matthew xix. 14; St. Mark x. 14, is very familiar. But every mother knows that it prevents her from quoting these words of Jesus to her children as they stand in the Bible she uses. Surely no rendering is more inappropriate than one which connects the coming of little ones to Christ with suffering.

The Revisers have done good service by rendering *ζωοποιῶν* in 1 Corinthians xv. 45 by *life-giving*. Would

it not have been better to do this throughout rather than retain the rendering *quicken*, which to very many readers is unintelligible? Even the words *wit* and *wot* are to most of those for whom a translation of the Bible is most needed much less clear and forceful than *know* and *knew*.

The word *Hades* instead of *Hell* is a great gain; a gain which will probably be still more apparent when we have the Revised Old Testament. We may hope that it will in time do something to remove the present confusion in many minds of the state of the departed awaiting judgment with the state of those condemned at the Last Day. But the adoption of this word makes all the more inexplicable the refusal of a place in the new text to the still more distinctive word *Gehenna*. The rendering *Hell of fire* furnishes a remarkable example of men doing something yet afraid to do the one right thing which lay ready to their hand.

The marginal distinction in the New Version between *ναός* and *ἱερόν* is an undoubted gain. But the distinction of these two altogether different words ought to have been in the text. And to ordinary Englishmen, whatever the etymology may be, the word *temple* denotes a building devoted to God. And this is the true sense of *ναός*. On the other hand, *ἱερόν* denotes the entire sacred precinct, including the courts and porticoes around the sacred house. The rendering *temple* for *ἱερόν* suggests to thousands of readers that Christ and others actually walked in the sacred house. If this had been so, we need not wonder that the high priests called his attention to the impropriety of the children shouting¹ after Him in the temple. The word *temple* should, I think, be kept for *ναός*. For *ἱερόν*, *sacred place* would be a good equivalent, putting this word in connexion with other *sacred things* in 1 Corinthians ix. 13; x. 28; Romans xv. 16.

¹ St. Matthew xxi. 15.

The American suggestion that *demon* for *δαίμων* be in the text instead of in the margin seems to me good, as reproducing a distinction which all the New Testament writers who touch the subject scrupulously maintain. But even the marginal note is of great value.

I also wish that against the first occurrence of the word *Christ* there had been in the margin the explanation *Anointed*. The presence of this last word in the text of Acts iv. 26, with *Christ* in the margin, is a great gain.

The very worst and most inexcusable rendering of a Greek word which the New Version retains is, in my view, the word *Ghost* as a rendering of *πνεῦμα* in certain positions. So utterly dead, and therefore meaningless, is the word *Ghost*, that it cannot be used without the adjective *Holy*, nor with it if governing a genitive case as in Ephesians i. 13; iv. 30; 1 Thessalonians iv. 8. The only meaning the word has in modern English is a disembodied spirit. But even in this its only sense so objectionable is the word that the Revisers have not dared to render St. Luke xxiv. 37: *They supposed that they beheld a ghost*. It is now only a meaningless algebraic symbol which, joined to the adjective *holy*, theologians have thought fit to retain as a technical term for the Third Person of the Divine Trinity. It is thus a convenient embodiment of what I believe to be a correct deduction from the teaching of the New Testament. But for this reason it ought not to appear on the Sacred Page.

Moreover there is nothing whatever to gain by the use of this rendering. It suggests, even to the most intelligent reader, no conception suggested by the Greek word *πνεῦμα* and not suggested by the English rendering *Spirit*. On the other hand it obscures, so far as it has any influence at all, the one conception which the word *πνεῦμα* in all its connexions everywhere embodies. Especially it obscures the essential oneness of the nature of the human spirit and of the Spirit of God. To make this oneness of nature

conspicuous, the Holy Spirit thought fit to assume for Himself in the Inspired Books no designation except the word which also denotes the noblest element in man, marking the distinction where needful by the added words *of God, of Christ*, or by the significant adjective *Holy*. Surely we need not create a distinction which God has not made, by giving to the Spirit a different name.

It is worthy of notice that in the New Version the word *Ghost* has been in some places, *e.g.*, 1 Corinthians xii. 3, displaced by *Spirit*; because the former word obscured the connexion with the word *Spirit* in the context. The same reason demands that this useless and objectionable word be removed from the entire New Testament. For the whole is the context of every verse it contains.

After all this fault-finding, I cannot but say that the Revised Version is an unspeakable gain to all who read English. It is on the whole as good as we could fairly expect. It will be noticed that every one of the foregoing strictures is directed against a rendering retained from the Old Version. So that even if my strictures be just, we are no losers by the New Version. And it will be noticed that in close connexion with each stricture I have pointed to indisputable gains. The improvements I have mentioned are very numerous; and some of them have directly and indirectly great importance. Moreover, they suggest to the careful student a multitude of other similar improvements.

Against all these gains, in the department of the subject which has been considered in this paper, I know of no drawbacks worthy of the name. The objections made, not altogether without reason, against the style of the New Version, have but little bearing upon the rendering of Greek words. They affect chiefly the matter of my next paper. But defects of style are unworthy to be compared with the many and great improvements noted above.

I may say that the whole matter of the style of the New Version will receive due treatment from the very able pen of Dr. Sanday.

In another paper I hope to discuss the new renderings of Greek grammatical forms. I purpose to take up the various matters which in Greek Grammars fall under the head of Syntax; and to discuss the degree to which the Revisers have reproduced in English the sense which the Writers of the New Testament intended to convey by their use of Greek inflexions and particles and order of words. This task will be even more difficult than that which in this paper I have attempted. I shall not be able to give, as I have done here, my approval to all the changes the Revisers have made. At the same time, I shall endeavour to shew that on the whole they have done their work well, and have given to the millions who speak the English language a translation far better than any which has hitherto been published.

JOSEPH AGAR BEEET.

THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.

IN a recent article in the *Expositor*,¹ Professor Wace has referred to the feeling which often arises in the minds of those who contemplate the heavens, "that man is too insignificant a creature to evoke those displays of the Divine love and grace of which our Faith speaks;" and has remarked that "some feeling of this kind is probably at the root of many difficulties felt by thoughtful men of science at the present day." There can be no doubt that this feeling prevails extensively, and operates powerfully; and it must be admitted that, at first sight, it seems not

¹ Vol. i., *Present Series*, pages 73-4.