

this side of the grave. "As to a still-born miscarriage he appeared to me;"—just such had been in that hour the sensation of St. Paul's own soul.

An experience like this was not only one whose occurrence could never have been forgotten by the Apostle, but must also have stamped the sensations attending it upon his memory with so sharply-cut a distinctness as could never be obliterated. I apprehend that this is what he means when he writes to the Corinthians, that he "*knew the terror of the Lord*;" for it is of the Lord Jesus that he there speaks (2 Cor. v. 11).

Thenceforward, through the new life which Christ's infinite loving-kindness imparted to him, and in the animating power of grateful love to Him as his Redeemer, it became (as he says in that same pathetic passage of personal history) his one eager aim so to comport himself in his service that, when that other hour should arrive in which he should find himself manifested before the judgment seat to receive his final award, he might be found well-pleasing unto Him;—not, again, and not *then*, to hear from the lips of that All-Holy One words of remonstrance and rebuke, but to receive back at his hands the good things which through his grace alone he should be found to have done in the body.

E. HUXTABLE.

---

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW  
TESTAMENT.

ON CERTAIN DIFFICULT AND IMPORTANT PASSAGES.

IN my former papers I expressed a confident belief that the Revised Version is a much more correct reproduction in English of the sense intended by the writers of the New Testament than that given in the Authorised Version. In

spite, however, of greatly preponderant excellences, I could not forbear to point out what seemed to me to be defects in the new rendering of Greek words and grammatical forms. But nearly all these were only retentions, needless and unwise retentions I believe, of defects already existing in the Authorised Version. They were merely cases in which there was not a majority of two-thirds in favour of change. In this paper I shall discuss a few renderings of solitary passages, all of them specially interesting or specially difficult, which seem to me further removed than the old renderings from the sense of the Original.

In Romans viii. 16, 26, instead of *the Spirit itself* we have in the New Version *the Spirit himself*; without any alternative in the margin; a rendering which implies expressly, by the simple grammatical force of the words used, as a matter not open to question, that the Spirit of God is a person. That this is a correct inference from the New Testament as a whole, I firmly believe. But it is by no means implied in the Greek words found in Romans viii. 16 or 26. And translators have no right to compel their readers to learn from a single verse that which they would not themselves have known but for their study of other, and in this case far removed, portions of the Bible. They ought as far as possible so to put the Scriptures before their readers that the same passages shall proclaim the same truths to learned and unlearned alike. Even the ambiguities of Scripture should, if possible, be reproduced. That this is not always possible in the text, owing to the different compass of Greek and English forms of speech, I admit. In these cases, the translator is compelled, in spite of himself, to become an expositor. He ought, therefore, to put in the margin the rendering required by the exposition he rejects; so that his readers may know that an alternative is grammatically allowable, and therefore open to the expositor's choice.

The above is one of the very few passages in which the judgment of the Revisers seems to have been warped by something apparently akin to theological bias.

This incorrect rendering, like all such, is an injustice, not only to those who do not believe the doctrine involved in it, but to those who do. For, that the Greek name of the Spirit of God is a neuter substantive accompanied by neuter pronouns, is in my view very significant. It reminds us how constantly the third Person of the divine Trinity, although a distinct person sharing with the Father and the Son all divine attributes and working out by his own divine power all the operations of God, nevertheless withdraws for the more part his own personality from public view, that all eyes may be fixed on one object, viz. the Eternal Son, who is the Image of the invisible God. And just so far as the Spirit reigns in us shall we efface ourselves in order that Christ alone may be exalted.

Of the difficulty of using the words *it* and *itself* when speaking of one whom we believe to be both a person and divine, I am fully conscious. Even the Authorised Version uses a masculine pronoun in Romans viii. 27, *he maketh intercession*. Here the difficulty might be avoided by the use of italics: "according to *the will of God the Spirit* maketh intercession for saints." Or, if the words *he, himself*, are put in the text, there should be in the margin, "Gr. *it, itself*."

In the new version of 2 Corinthians iii. 18 are three clear gains; *unveiled* instead of *open*, *mirror* instead of *glass*, *transformed* instead of *changed*.<sup>1</sup> But the word *reflecting*, with *beholding* removed to the margin, seems to me a serious error and loss. The word thus rendered, *κατοπτρίζω*, derived from the common Greek word for *mirror*, is found in the active voice only, so far as I know, in p. 894*d* of the *Morals* of Plutarch; meaning to *shew*

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. ii., Second Series, pages 97, 100.

reflected in a mirror. In the middle voice, in the sense of seeing oneself reflected in a mirror, it is found in Artemidorus, *On Dreams*, ii. 7; Athenæus, v. 687e; Diogenes Laertius, ii. 33. (Cognate words in the same sense are found in one or two passages.) It is also found, in the sense of to see an object in a mirror, in Philo, *Allegories*, iii. 33: "let me not see thy form mirrored (*μηδὲ κατοπτρισαίμην*) in anything else except in Thyself, even in God." This passage, like that before us, refers to Moses talking with God at Sinai. The middle voice denotes, according to a very frequent use, the effect which Moses hoped to receive from the vision he prayed for. The same use is also found in Philo's *Migration of Abraham*, ch. xvii., where to denote seeing oneself in a mirror the middle voice *ἐνοπτρίζονται* is followed by *ἑαυτούς*. Compare also Plutarch, *Morals*, pp. 696a and 143c.

Chrysostom, followed by Theodoret, expounds the word as meaning "reflect like a mirror." But it is not found in this sense, to my knowledge, in any independent passage. This meaning was suggested to Chrysostom probably only by this verse. The verb in question is never predicated of the reflecting mirror; but always, in the active voice of him who causes the reflection, and in the middle voice of him who sees reflected in a mirror either himself or some object beneficial (or hurtful) to himself. Of these two meanings of the middle voice, the latter is in the passage before us suggested at once by the accusative, *τὴν δόξαν*, governed by the verb. And that this is the sense designed by the Apostle is made clear by the context. For, if the unveiled ones are already reflecting the glory of Christ, it is needless and meaningless to say, as the Revisers make St. Paul say, that they *are being transformed into the same image*: for the change would be already effected, especially as the word *image* suggests outward form, not inward essence. The other rendering,

now pushed into the margin, states appropriately the means of the change, viz. contemplation of the reflected glory; and thus supplies the link connecting the *unveiled face* with the progressive transformation *into the same image*. It also keeps up the contrast, suggested by *we all*, of the unveiled Christians and the veiled Jews; while the word *transformed* reminds us of Moses returning unveiled into the presence of God, and thus rekindling his faded brightness. All this is obscured by the rendering adopted by the Revisers.

The Authorised rendering, *the Spirit of the Lord*, is properly abandoned. For it involves an inversion for which no reason can be conceived. But the Revisers have found no place, even in the margin, for the very simple, and I believe correct, rendering, *the Lord of the Spirit*. The words in question refer undoubtedly to Verse 17a. St. Paul has expressed a hope that the heart of Israel will turn to the Lord. And he remembers that to turn to *the Lord is* to turn to *the Spirit*. In other words, between the Son and the Spirit is a relation so intimate that to accept the one is to accept the other. This intimate relation, a practical identity of two distinct Persons, St. Paul embodies in the words *the Lord is the Spirit*. They are akin to the words of Christ in John x. 30, *I and my Father are one*; which give a reason and proof that no one can pluck the sheep of Christ from his hands, viz., because to do this is to pluck them from the hands of his Father. Each of these passages leads us up to the mysterious relation of the Persons of the Divine Trinity. And to this relation the concluding words of Verse 18 certainly refer. The only question is whether St. Paul designed the word *Πνεύματος* to be in apposition with, or governed by, *Κυρίου*. The latter seems to me the simpler mode of conceiving his thought. When two substantives, each in the genitive case, denote different persons or objects, objects not often

mentioned in apposition, it is most easy to understand the second genitive as subordinate to the first, implying that the objects are related, but leaving the relation, as the genitive of itself always does, quite indefinite. To take the second genitive in apposition to the first, is to assume that the relation of the two objects is that of identity. In virtue of the relation embodied in the strong words of Verse 17, *the Lord is the Spirit*, the Spirit is immediately afterwards appropriately called *the Spirit of the Lord*. And with equal right Christ may be called the *Lord of the Spirit*; inasmuch as from Him goes forth the Holy Spirit to reproduce his mind in his disciples. St. Paul teaches that the transformation *accords* with the mysterious relation to the Holy Spirit of Him whose *glory* the *unveiled* ones *behold reflected* in the Gospel *mirror*. The revised rendering is certainly better than the old one; for it suggests St. Paul's indisputable reference to Verse 17a. But it is obscure. The Revisers' marginal note, "Gr. *the Spirit* which is *the Lord*," is incorrect and almost meaningless.

Exceedingly wretched is the Revisers' rendering of their amended reading in 2 Corinthians iv. 6: *Light shall shine out of darkness*. A mere schoolboy, following the Greek order, might have given the more exact rendering of St. Paul's intensely graphic words, *Out of darkness light shall shine*. Similarly, Romans i. 14 should have been: *Both to Greeks and to Barbarians, both to wise men and to foolish, I am debtor*. These cases, which might be multiplied indefinitely, illustrate one of the most conspicuous defects of the New Version, viz., the almost total absence of poetic instinct. Whether in a large committee and in majorities of two-thirds it is reasonable to expect a poet's ear and eye, I cannot say. But, certainly, without these no first-rate literary work has ever been accomplished.

In 2 Corinthians v. 16, the Revisers retain the word *him* in italics, an insertion which in my view obscures com-

pletely the sense of the whole clause. In consequence of his judgment (Verse 15) that Christ died for all, etc., St. Paul's life has so altogether ceased that he no longer sees men as rich or poor, Jews or Gentiles, enemies or friends, but as those for whom Christ died. In former days it was otherwise. Of this he gives an extreme case. So accustomed was he to look upon men according to bodily appearance and surroundings, that even upon Christ he looked thus; he thought of Him as a mere Jew from Nazareth, a feeble man of flesh and blood, whose teaching he could easily crush out. Indeed, all the disciples knew Christ first as a man; till through the veil of flesh they saw his real dignity. But, in spite of having gone so far in knowing men *according to flesh* as even to know Christ thus, to St. Paul all knowing according to flesh is past. The object of *γινώσκωμεν* is quite unlimited. It cannot be limited to knowing Christ. Nor can this be St. Paul's reference. That he did not know Christ according to flesh was so evident that it could not need this emphatic and contrasted assertion. He mentions Christ only as an aggravated case, from his own past life, of knowing according to flesh; and now gives, in contrast, a repetition of the general assertion which is the chief matter of this verse: "If we have even known Christ according to flesh, yet now no longer do we know *men thus*."

In Galatians ii. 16,<sup>1</sup> instead of *knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ*, the New Version gives *save through faith*. This rendering suggests or implies that if a man have faith he may be justified by works of Law. But, that this is not implied in St. Paul's words, is evident from Matthew xii. 4, *which it was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them that were with him, but only for the priests*; Luke iv. 26,

<sup>1</sup> On this verse see an excellent paper by the Bishop of Llandaff, in *Public Opinion* for Sept. 17, 1881.

27, *there were many widows in Israel . . . and unto none of them was Elijah sent, but only to Zarephath . . . and none of them was cleansed, but only Naaman the Syrian*; Revelation xxi. 27, *there shall in no wise enter into it anything unclean . . . but only they which are written in the Lamb's book of life*. In all these cases the particles  $\epsilon\iota$   $\mu\eta$  retain their exceptive force: but the exception is taken, not to  $\omicron\upsilon\kappa$   $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\delta\omicron\nu$   $\eta\nu$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$   $\phi\alpha\rho\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ , but only to  $\omicron\upsilon\kappa$   $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\delta\omicron\nu$   $\eta\nu$   $\phi\alpha\rho\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ : and similarly in the other passages. And these cases warn us not to extend in Galatians ii. 16 the exceptive force of the same particles beyond St. Paul's chief thought, *is not justified*. The Revisers have extended it to the whole phrase, *is not justified by the works of the law*; and have thus modified materially the sense of the verse. This is the more remarkable because in the passages quoted above they have adopted, without any marginal note, the very good rendering *but only*, which in the passage before us they have put in the margin as an alternative. But I think it claims a place in the text.

In Philippians ii. 6, instead of *thought it not robbery to be equal with God*, the New Version renders *counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God*. The word *prize*, which English readers will naturally understand to mean something received as a reward, the Revisers explain in a marginal note to mean *a thing to be grasped*. This last verb we use only of objects not already in our grasp, or at least not within our firm grasp. The meaning of the new rendering is put beyond doubt by the excellent commentaries of two of the Revisers, Bishops Ellicott and Lightfoot, of whom the latter gives as a paraphrase "a treasure to be clutched and retained at all hazards." This interpretation suggests that the equality with God which the Son did not regard as a treasure to be clutched and retained, He actually surrendered, *i.e.*, that He actually ceased to be equal with God. This is the only practical

significance of St. Paul's words thus expounded. For we have no hint that the *equality with God* was merely a human recognition of Christ's divine dignity.

This exposition supposes that, although wishing to convey the very common and grammatically correct sense of the very common word *ἄρπαγμα*, St. Paul went out of his way to find a very rare word which by its form suggests an altogether different sense. But a careful writer's rejection of a common word and choice of a rare one implies that the rare word chosen conveys, and the word rejected does not convey, his intended sense. And this intended sense we must seek in the difference between the words rejected and chosen. Now *ἄρπαγμα* is a passive form, denoting an object seized: *ἄρπαγμός* is an active form, a seizing. And Paul's choice of this latter word can be accounted for only by supposing that he wished to convey an active sense.

Again, *ἀρπάζω* and its cognates denote a strong-handed taking hold of something not already in our hands. Unfortunately I am not now able to verify the various passages quoted by Dr. Lightfoot in proof that *ἀρπάζω* and its cognates are sometimes used to denote a mere clutching of treasure already our own. But the quotations do not on their face convey this proof. On the contrary, one of them, Eusebius, *Church History*, viii. 12, *τὸν θάνατον ἄρπαγμα θέμενοι*, certainly does not refer to something already possessed and tenaciously held. For the persons in question did not hold fast to death as something they would not surrender, but by flinging themselves from high roofs they laid hold of death, as if by violence, and made it their own. And this is the exact ordinary sense of *ἀρπάζω* and of substantives in *-μα*. I also observe in Dr. Lightfoot's paraphrase something like contradiction. For he says that *ἄρπαγμα* "is employed like *ἔρμαιον, εὕρημα*, to denote 'a highly-prized possession, an unexpected gain.'" Are these last terms synonymous? The word "gain" implies

acquisition of that which before was not ours; and so do ἔρμαιον and εὕρημα. Are we to understand St. Paul to teach that the Eternal Son's equality with the Father is in any sense an acquisition?

All this proves that the obscure rendering given by the Revisers, and the exposition of it given by Drs. Ellicott and Lightfoot, involve a double difficulty, viz. St. Paul's inexplicable choice of a rare active form to convey a passive sense, when a common passive form was ready to his hand; and his use of a very common word in a sense of which I have not seen an example.

In view of the almost insuperable combination of difficulties besetting the rendering just discussed, I venture to suggest another. Let us accept the active sense of ἀρπαγμός, and the usual meaning of the verb from which it is derived. It denotes "taking hold with a strong hand," but not necessarily of other men's goods. It implies force, but not necessarily injustice. For want of a better word, I will paraphrase it *high-handed self-enriching*, or more accurately but less forcefully *high-handed taking to himself*. St. Paul refers, not to acquirement of wealth, *i.e.*, capacity of self-indulgence, but to the taking and drinking of the cups of happiness held out to the Eternal Son. But the poverty of language compels me to use words not quite accurate. The Son did not look upon his equality with God, *i.e.*, his possession of divine powers, as a self-enriching, or as we should say a means of self-enrichment. He was the very opposite of some whom St. Paul describes in 1 Timothy vi. 5, νομιζόντων πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν, which the Revisers render, *supposing that godliness is a way of gain*. This use of a simple substantive as predicate to denote coincidence, *i.e.*, practical identity, where we should use a circumlocution, is very common in the New Testament. Compare 1 John v. 3, 4: *This is the love of God, that we may keep his commandments; this*

is the victory which hath conquered the world, our faith. And it is a correct and forceful expression of human thought. For instance, a Turkish Pasha might look upon governorship of a province as a self-enriching. In his mind, to be governor and to be constantly enriching himself were practically the same. For with him they always went together. And it seems to me that in the verse before us we have a similar mode of thought.

The words thus taken in their natural sense give a good meaning to the whole passage. Not as a means of self-gratification in the palace of the skies did Christ look upon his divine perogatives. This was not their worth in his view. He did not use his strong hand to bring pleasure to Himself. But this is exactly what the gods of the Pantheon of Greek mythology did. They were only big men who used their superhuman powers for their own selfish enjoyment. The absolute opposite of this, Christ did. It is true that He used violence: but it was upon HIMSELF. The man who seizes with violence frequently empties those on whom he lays his hand. And so did the Son of God; BUT it was HIMSELF HE EMPTIED. Thus *ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν* forms the most tremendous contrast conceivable to *ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγάσαστο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ*. These last words suggest what Christ might have done (for He was armed with divine power), if He had been like the deities with whom the fancy of the Greeks had peopled their heavens. The words following tell us what He actually did.

It may be objected that, since all things belonged already to the Son, He could not conceivably enrich Himself. But *ἀρπάξω* does not necessarily involve taking what is not our own. An owner may lay hold of the grapes on his own vines. At the moment of his incarnation the continued joys of heaven were before the Son. But instead of taking and drinking the cups of celestial happiness, *He emptied*

*Himself*. He did this because from eternity He had not looked upon his own divine powers as a means of his own enjoyment. It will be noticed that whatever weight there is in the above objection bears with equal force, I believe greater force, against the exposition embodied in the Revised Version.

A really satisfactory rendering for the exposition given above, I cannot find. In lack of a better I suggest: NOT HIGH-HANDED SELF-INDULGING DID HE DEEM HIS EQUALITY WITH GOD. This rendering preserves well the order of the words, the active sense of the termination *-μος*, and the idea, ever present in *ἀπράζω*, of a strong hand. The word *self-indulging* avoids the idea of acquisition which would be suggested by *self-enriching*. It limits, however, unduly the root-meaning of the word thus translated: but the limitation is suggested by the context.

The foregoing exposition I offer with diffidence. The serious objections to the exposition now common compel me to seek a better. And such, I believe, I have now proposed. It retains the root idea of *ἀρπαγμός*, and accounts for its rare termination; and makes the clause a real addition to the sense of the passage. And it avoids the suggestion that at his incarnation the Son surrendered his equality with God: for it tells us, not what He did, but the way in which He viewed, or rather did not view, his own divine prerogatives, viz. not as a means of self-gratification.

In his mode of viewing his own divine powers Christ is our pattern. The mind which was in Him must be in us. Men of the world look upon their various powers as legitimate means of self-enjoyment and self-exaltation; and consider this to be their real worth. But the example of Christ has taught us better. Our various powers were given us that we may lay them, as He did, on the altar of God. And when we have done this we feel that in a

real and very solemn sense we have emptied ourselves of our former fancied fulness. Whether we shall thus empty ourselves depends upon the estimate we have formed about the meaning and purpose of our various powers.

One more passage I cannot refrain from discussing. In Titus ii. 13 the New Version reads: *looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ*. In the margin, as an alternative, we find the old rendering: *of the great God and our Saviour*.

The reading in the text gives to Christ unmistakably the title, *our Great God and Saviour*. And a title practically the same is involved in, or is most easily suggested by, the reading in the margin. That, taken by themselves in their mere grammatical force, St. Paul's words admit this sense, I readily concede. But they do not demand it. For with equal grammatical accuracy they admit the rendering, *appearance of the glory of the great God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ*. From the words as they stand we cannot be certain whether the term *great God* refers to the Father or to the Son. This, St. Paul left his readers to determine by their knowledge of his usual teaching. The grammatical latitude of the words in question is a matter so delicate and intricate that I shall not attempt to discuss it here. But I notice that both Winer and Ellicott, who take different views of the reference of these words, hold their opinions for exegetical reasons; and admit that each exposition is grammatically admissible. Dr. Ellicott, who gives in his commentary the rendering which the Revisers have put in their text, says: "it must be candidly avowed that it is *very* doubtful whether on the grammatical principle last alluded to (on which alone rests the application of the words *great God* to Christ) the interpretation of this passage can be fully settled. There is a *presumption* in favour of the adopted interpretation, but, on account of the defining genitive ἡμῶν, nothing more." He also adds: "It ought

not to be suppressed that some of the best Versions . . . and some Fathers of unquestioned orthodoxy adopted the other interpretation.”<sup>1</sup> I find no fault with the Revisers for the rendering they have put in their text; although my own study of St. Paul’s general teaching does not confirm its correctness. But certainly the alternative exposition, which Dr. Ellicott admits to be grammatically allowable, should have been put, clothed in unmistakable words, in the margin, instead of, or in addition to, the ambiguous rendering now found there. The readers of the New Version would then have judged for themselves, as students of the Original now judge, from St. Paul’s teaching elsewhere whether he meant to speak of *the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ* or *the great God and our Saviour, Jesus Christ*; or, as I believe, *of the blessed hope, even the appearance of the glory of the great God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ.*

This is one of the many passages in which the translator is compelled by the circumstances of the case to become also an expositor. In all such the rejected exposition, unless it be absolutely impossible, should have a place in the margin.

Firmly as I believe that the Son of God shares to the full with the Father all divine attributes and may therefore be correctly called *God* and is thus called in the Fourth Gospel, I do not think that He is ever so called in the Epistles of St. Paul. Certainly it is worthy of note that in all the passages, such as Romans i. 4, Philippians ii. 6, Colossians i. 15 ff., etc., in which St. Paul speaks expressly

<sup>1</sup> I cannot refrain from pointing out, in reply to Dr. Ellicott’s first objection to the exposition ignored by the Revisers, viz. “that *ἐπιφάνεια* is a term specially and peculiarly applied to the Son, and never to the Father,” that St. Paul does not here speak of the appearance of the great God but of *the appearance of the glory of the great God*, in full accord with Matthew xvi. 27, *the Son of Man will come in the glory of his Father.* The announcement of this coming is (1 Timothy i. 11) *the gospel of the glory of the blessed God.*

of the nature and glory of the Son, the explicit title *God* is not given to Him; that even as distinguished from the Son (*e.g.* 1 Corinthians iii. 23, viii. 6, xv. 28) the Father is called simply *God*; and that in all the passages in which St. Paul seems to speak of Christ explicitly as *God*, either the reading or rendering or exposition is open to doubt and is marked as doubtful in the New Version. This I venture to explain by suggesting that in St. Paul's day the theological education of the Church was not sufficiently advanced to make it safe, in view of surrounding polytheism, to use the word *God* as a common designation of Christ; but that the development of Christian thought justified the use of it by the last surviving Apostle, and that in the age following it became universal in the Church.

I cannot conclude this paper and series of papers without giving in a few words some estimate of the Revision as a whole. In the first place the Revision is thorough. With perfect candour and without concealment, and even without any presumption in favour of the Received Text and the Authorised Version, the Revisers have told us, in the best and plainest words they could find, the exact sense which they believe the Writers of the New Testament intended to convey. They might have acted, and many would have advised them to act, on other principles. They might have received into the New Version, or at least into the text of it, only those changes in reading and rendering which modern scholarship had placed beyond reasonable doubt. Had they done this, the New Version would have been merely an approach at a safe distance in the direction of the results attained by Biblical research. Instead of this, the Revisers have held the balance with steady hand and have given a place in the text to whichever reading or rendering seemed to them to have preponderant evidence, reserving for readings or renderings supported by evidence considerable but not preponderant a place in the margin.

Consequently, wherever there is no marginal note the English reader may accept the New Version with reasonable confidence as reproducing with tolerable accuracy the sense of the original. The Revisers have thus bridged over fairly and well the immense gulf formerly existing, and by many painfully felt, between the New Testament as read by scholars and as read by the millions who know it only through an English Version. Much more nearly than ever before can the whole Anglo-Saxon family of God now hear the same words from the lips of their heavenly Father. And this is an infinite gain.

The Revised Greek Text seems to me better than the Revised rendering of it. It is quite true, as Dr. Sanday has said, that the new Edition of the Greek Testament by Drs. Westcott and Hort, which with its Introduction and Appendix is now complete in our hands, has pointed out and opened up a new path of investigation in this grave study. It is also true that, although the principles of Textual Research propounded by these editors commend themselves to us at once, their application of these principles in detail can be fully and intelligently accepted only after careful sifting. But already Textual Criticism has given us abundant assured results; and has brought within narrow limits the readings still awaiting decision. And these assured results are embodied fairly and fully in the New Version.

The rendering of the Greek text affords greater scope for the subjectivity of the translator, and is therefore more open to criticism. But, after all reasonable objections, the New Version remains an immense improvement on the Old one. For many Greek words more accurate equivalents have been found; while of others the significance has been brought out with more fulness and force than before by the use of a constant, or more nearly constant English equivalent: grammatical forms very imperfectly understood

when the Authorised Version was made are now much better represented: and the emphasis of the original is in many cases more fully reproduced by a rearrangement of the words in the English translation. Against these indisputable gains the losses which can be set will be found, I firmly believe, to be few and small. The real blemishes will soon be detected and condemned by, we may hope, a tolerably unanimous consent of the best scholars; and enumerated. And, by enumeration, their effect will be lessened. The improvements will never be numbered.

While thus commending the New Version, I cannot forbear to express a hope that, after the Revised Old Testament has been published and has been estimated by those capable of judging its merits, the Revisers of the New Testament may be permitted to discuss again those readings and renderings against which there was a large adverse vote. The judgment of the Revisers would be matured by their own quiet thought and by their intercourse with others. And thus, I doubt not, we should have a Version still nearer to perfection than the noble work already in our hands. Such reconsideration would not involve very great time and cost. And it is demanded by the importance of having an English Version of the Bible as little as possible open to objection. In the meantime all lovers of the Bible may thank God that he has permitted this generation to see the great work which in these pages I have ventured to criticise.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

---