

*SOME LESSONS OF THE REVISED VERSION
OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.*

I. INTRODUCTORY.

1. It is my purpose in the following papers to offer some hints and helps to those who desire to study the Revised Version of the New Testament. I have no intention of entering into controversy. I shall take the book as it lies in our hands, and endeavour to show what fresh lessons we may learn from it. I shall assume therefore that my readers are anxious to use to the best purpose the fresh materials which the Revised Version offers for the understanding of the apostolic writings; and that to this end they will test for themselves the typical illustrations which I shall give of the purpose and nature of the changes which the Revisers have introduced.

I have, I say, no intention of entering into controversy; but I shall be disappointed if those who are able to follow out the lines of inquiry which I shall suggest, do not feel in the end, that most of the popular objections which are brought against the Revision are either altogether groundless, or outweighed by corresponding gains.

2. These objections, dealing with textual changes, and "pedantic literality," and "faulty rhythm," and the like, were of course constantly present to the Revisers during their ten years' labour. They are perfectly natural. Objections of a similar character and no less violent in expression were directed against Jerome's Latin Version, which in due time became "the Vulgate" of the Western Church, and

the Version of Tyndale, and the Revision of 1611;¹ and it has certainly been a satisfaction to those who gave time and thought to the work, that no criticism has come upon them by surprise. They heard in the Jerusalem Chamber all the arguments against their conclusions which they have heard since; and I may say for myself, without the least reserve, that no restatement of old arguments has in the least degree shaken my confidence in the general results which were obtained.

3. It has been, I repeat, a satisfaction to the Revisers to find, from the attacks which have been made upon their work that they were able to take account of all that could be said against the conclusions which they deliberately adopted

¹ A single illustration will be sufficient. Among the most indefatigable English Biblical students of the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. was Hugh Broughton, some time Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. He had published, in 1597, "an Epistle to the learned Nobility of England, touching translating the Bible from the original, with ancient warrant for every word, with the full satisfaction of any that be of heart"; and afterwards separate translations of Daniel, Job, and Lamentations. He was not, however, included among the Revisers, when "in 1607 the translation of the Bible was begun, from which work why he was secluded, whose abilities that way were known so well, may rather be wondered at, than resolved." But the surprise which Lightfoot thus expresses will hardly be felt by any one who has considered Broughton's manner towards those who differed from him.

When the revision appeared, Broughton sent a brief notice of it to "a right worshipful knight, attendant upon the king": "The late Bible (Right Worshipful) was sent me to censure, which bred in me a sadness that will grieve me while I breathe. It is so ill done. Tell his Majesty that I had rather be rent in pieces with wild horses than any such translation by my consent should be urged upon poor churches." He then gives ten points in which opinions that he had advocated were not adopted, and concludes: "I blame not this, that they keep the usual style of former translations in the Church, that the people should not be amazed. For the learned, the Geneva might be made exact; for which pains whole thirty years I have been called upon, and spent much time to my great loss, by wicked hindrance. When you find the king at leisure, show his Majesty this short advertisement. And if his Highness bid me again, as once by the Earl of Pembroke, show faulty places, I will in a few sheets translate what I blame most, that they might be sent to all churches that have bought Bibles. So all may be well pacified. The king meant royally; but froward would be froward; who have felt it as I was sure they would. . . ."

So the learned and impracticable scholar wrote; but in due time the judgment of English-speaking Christendom went against him.

with a full sense of their responsibility. But it is a far deeper satisfaction to them that their work has given a powerful impulse to a close and patient investigation of the apostolic texts. And the claim which they confidently make—the claim which alone could justify their labours—is that they have placed the English reader far more nearly than before in the position of the Greek scholar; that they have made it possible for him to trace out innumerable subtleties of harmonious correspondence between different parts of the New Testament which were hitherto obscured; that they have given him a copy of the original which is marked by a faithfulness unapproached, I will venture to say, by any other ecclesiastical version. And while they have done this, they have at the same time given him the strongest possible assurance of the substantial soundness of the familiar English rendering which they have reviewed with the most candid and unreserved criticism.

4. This endeavour after faithfulness was indeed the ruling principle of the whole work. From first to last, the single object of the Revisers was to allow the written words to speak to Englishmen for themselves, without any admixture of gloss, or any suppression of roughness. Faithfulness must, indeed, be the supreme aim of the Biblical translator. In the record of a historical Revelation no sharp line can be drawn between the form and the spirit. The form is the spirit. The Bible is, we believe, not only a collection of most precious literary monuments, but the original charter of our Faith. No one can presume to say that the least variation is unimportant. The translator, at any rate, is bound to place all the facts in evidence, as far as it is possible for him to do so. He must feel that in such a case he has no right to obscure the least shade of expression which can be rendered; or to allow any prepossessions as to likelihood or fitness to outweigh direct evidence, and still less any attractiveness of a graceful

phrase to hinder him from applying most strictly the ordinary laws of criticism to the determination and to the rendering of the original text. He will accept, without the least misgiving, the canon that the Bible must be interpreted "like any other book"; and his reward will be, to find that it is by the use of this reverent freedom he becomes assured with a conviction, rational and immovable, that it is not like any other book.

5. Difficulties and differences of opinion necessarily arise in determining the relative claims of faithfulness and elegance of idiom when they come into conflict. But the example of the Authorised Version seems to show that it is better to incur the charge of harshness, than to sacrifice a peculiarity of language, which, if it does nothing else, arrests attention, and reminds the reader that there is something in the words which is held to be more precious than the music of a familiar rhythm. The Bible, indeed, has most happily enriched our language with many turns of Hebrew idiom,¹ and I believe that the Revision of the N.T. does not contain anything unusual either in expression or in order which is not justified by the Old Version.

6. But it will be observed that the continuous effort to give in the Revision an exact representation of the original text, has necessarily led to a large number of minute changes in form and order. We shall see afterwards, I trust, the reason of many of these variations. I notice them now in passing, because such comparatively trivial changes arrest the attention of the reader first, and he is inclined to ask, as the Revisers were constantly asking themselves, Is it worth while? With their experience and their responsibility, he would, I believe, feel regret that here and there they lost the courage of their convictions, and so have failed to conform even such details as "heaven" and "heavens" rigorously to the Greek forms.

¹ Who, for example, would alter, "With desire I have desired" (Luke xxii. 15) ?

7. Substantial variations of text and rendering are matters of more serious importance. We might, perhaps, have wished, in thoughtless haste, that there had been no room for doubt as to the apostolic words or as to their exact meaning. But further reflection will show how greatly we gain by the fact that the record of revelation, even as the revelation itself, comes to us in the way of human life, exercising every power of man, and hallowing the service of his whole nature. The fact, when we face it, is seen to be a part of our religious discipline. And a version of the New Testament for popular use and study, ought to take account of the existence of variations in the reading of the original text, and of conflicting interpretations of it. There can be no legitimate authority, no prescription of use, to decide questions of criticism. When the Caliph Othman fixed a text of the Koran and destroyed all the old copies which differed from his standard, he provided for the uniformity of subsequent MSS. at the cost of their historical foundation. A classical text which rests finally on a single archetype is that which is open to the most serious suspicions. A book which is free from all ambiguities can hardly deal with the last problems of human experience, or give natural expression to human feelings and impressions.

In both these respects—in the determination of the Greek text and in the translation of it—the Revised Version exhibits a loyal regard to wide general consent tested again and again by successive discussions. It exhibits no preponderance of private opinion. It is, so to speak, the resultant of many conflicting forces. Each Reviser gladly yielded his own conviction to more or less serious opposition. Each school, among the Revisers, if the term may be used, prevailed in its turn, yet so as to leave on record the opinion which failed to obtain acceptance. The margin, therefore, offers the reader continually alternative

readings and renderings, which form one of the most important lessons of the Revision.

8. It is true that individual critics may be able to satisfy their own doubts, to lay down with confidence exactly what the Apostles wrote and what they meant, but the ablest and best-disciplined scholars, no less than the boldest, know that their conclusions do not find universal acceptance. They will be the last to wish, even if they were able, to impose the peculiarities of their private convictions upon a popular and public work. But experience gradually fixes the area of debate within recognised limits; and a faithful version of the N.T. will take account of all cases of reasonable uncertainty. This the Revised Version has done with general (if not uniform) consistency and completeness. And in this respect there is no feature of the Revised Version which is more important than the margin. For the margin contains a compact record of such variations in reading and rendering as seemed to the Company, by a repeated vote, to require consideration. The margin, it must be remembered, is an integral part of the revision. It very frequently records the opinion of the majority of the Revisers. And it is the more important to lay stress on this point, because it is constantly overlooked, not only by the assailants of the work, but also by careful students.

9. The Revision consists in fact of four distinct elements, of which the reader must take separate account.

- (1) The continuous English text.
- (2) The alternative readings in the margin.
- (3) The alternative renderings in the margin.
- (4) The American suggestions, which are printed in an Appendix.

Let me endeavour to show how the student will estimate the value of their several elements in relation to the Authorised Version.

Four main cases will arise, according as there is or is

not a note upon any particular passage in the margin or in the Appendix.

(a) The Revised Version may agree with the Authorised Version, without any margin or comment.

(b) The R.V. may differ from the A.V. without any margin or comment.

(c) The R.V. may agree with the A.V., with a margin or comment, or both.

(d) The R.V. may differ from the A.V., with a margin or comment, or both.

The first case includes the main body of the English text; and in regard to this the reader has the fullest possible assurance that it adequately represents in substance, form and expression, the original Greek.

The second case includes a large proportion of the changes made in the revision; and here the reader has an assurance of the validity of the English text scarcely less complete than in the former case. He knows that the text as it stands was for the most part approved or acquiesced in by all the members of the English and American Companies, who took part in the final revision of the passage; for it very rarely happened that a strong opinion, even of a small minority, failed to obtain recognition in the margin.

The two remaining cases require to be very carefully distinguished.

If the text of the R.V. gives the reading or rendering of the A.V. with a margin, it is sufficient that the text should have been supported by one-third of the Company who voted on the question, while the margin may record the judgment of the remaining two-thirds.¹ If on the other hand the text presents the change, then this change must have approved itself to at least two-thirds of the scholars who took part in the division. The A.V. in other words, and the Greek text which presumably it renders, had a

¹ See *Rule 5*, and the *Revisers' Preface*, iii. § 1.

preference in the proportion of two to one. Such a preference was a reasonable safeguard against the influence of private opinion ; and the general and perfectly independent concurrence of the American Revisers in the results which were finally adopted by the English Company, shows how well-fitted these simple rules were to secure a Greek text and a rendering suited by the common consent of Biblical scholars for ordinary use.

10. Let me, even at the risk of tediousness, illustrate these various cases by examples taken from the first chapter of St. John's Gospel.

I need say nothing of the general coincidence of the Authorised and Revised Versions. Nearly eight-ninths of the old words remain wholly unchanged ; and here, as elsewhere, careful attention is needed to note the differences. Yet there are differences between the Old and the New, and those of moment. And it may be added that changes due to changed readings in the original Greek form about one-sixth of the whole number.

11. There are variations both in reading and in rendering which are adopted without any margin ; for example, in *v. 27*, the words *who is preferred before me*, were omitted by the English Company by general consent : and again in *v. 14*, the rendering *the Word became flesh* was similarly adopted without difference of opinion for *the Word was made flesh*.

The American Revisers make no comment on these changes. The reader may therefore accept these changes as practically unquestionable ; and they are types, as I said, of a large proportion of the changes in the revision.

12. So far we have dealt with results which represent substantial unanimity among the Revisers ; but there are also marginal notes both on readings and on renderings. These record differences of opinion in the Companies, and illustrate the third and fourth cases.

Thus in *v.* 18 there is a very remarkable reading. The text preserves the words of A.V. *the only begotten Son*; but we find in the margin "Many very ancient authorities read *God only begotten.*" The English reader therefore will know that at least one-third (if not more) of those who voted on the question of reading were in favour of the reading rendered by the Authorised Version; and on referring to the American Appendix he will find that the American Revisers did not dissent from their judgment. But the marginal reading may express the opinion of a majority of the English Company, and in fact did so.

In *v.* 28 the R.V. reads *Bethany* for the A.V. *Bethabara*. Here therefore at least two-thirds of the members who voted (and not as before, one-third) must have supported the reading *Bethany*; while the margin records the variations which were set aside by the majority.

13. From disputed readings we pass to disputed renderings, to which also the same rule applies, requiring a majority of two-thirds for a variation from A.V. in the text.

In *v.* 29 the rendering of A.V. (*which*) *taketh away the sin (of the world)* is kept with the margin or *beareth the sin*. It is therefore at least possible that a majority of the English Revisers preferred the margin; but in that case they were not supported by the American Company, who do not propose any change. On the other hand it will be seen that the American Revisers wish to substitute the rendering *through* for *by* in *vv.* 3, 10, 17, and their concurrence with the margin against A.V. suggests the true inference that there was in the English Company a preponderance of opinion in favour of the margin, though less than two to one.

In *v.* 5, the rendering of A.V. *comprehended* was not supported by one-third of the English Revisers. Of the other renderings which were advocated, *apprehended* was adopted

by a simple majority, with the variant *overcame*, and in this conclusion the American Company agreed.

14. It may be worth while to notice another form of margin, which calls attention to the exact form of the original. Thus in *v. 14* on *dwelt* we read the note "Greek *tabernacled*." The peculiar word is marked in order to bring to the reader's mind two passages of the Apocalypse: *vii. 15, He that sitteth on the throne shall spread His tabernacle over them; xxi. 3, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men.*

15. I shall have an opportunity hereafter, I hope, of calling attention to some of the marginal notes. I wish now only to point out one most important service which they render to the English reader. They show with fair accuracy and completeness the extent of the uncertainty which attaches to the Greek text and to the literal rendering of the text. Popular controversy is apt to convey a false view of this uncertainty, by dwelling on a few passages of exceptional interest. In this respect nothing, I believe, can be more reassuring to the ordinary student than to notice the number and the character of the variants in a chapter or a book, and to remember that, with these exceptions, the text in his hands represents the united and deliberate judgment of a larger and more varied body of scholars than has ever on any other occasion discussed together a version of the N.T. into another language.

16. I have said that faithfulness, the most candid and the most scrupulous, was the central aim of the Revisers; but perfect faithfulness is impossible. No two languages are absolutely commensurate in vocabulary and construction. Biblical English is indeed, I believe, the best modern representative of Biblical Greek, but still it cannot preserve all the suggestive features of the original. The best translation can be no more than an imperfect copy, made in different materials: under the most favourable circumstances, an engraving, as it were, of the master's drawing.

Thus the student of a version of the N.T. will take account of the difficulties which beset the translator, before he passes judgment on the work; and nothing will tend so powerfully to remove the objections to a version necessarily imperfect, as a just estimate of the complexity of the questions involved in rendering words which we feel to be "living oracles." I am anxious, therefore, to help English readers to feel how arduous the work of revision was, before I enter on a consideration of the changes which were made in the Revision.

17. Sometimes a single Greek word conveys a fulness of meaning for which we have no English equivalent expression. *Repent*, to take one example only, is nearer in thought to the Greek than *agite pœnitentiam* of the Latin Vulgate (inadequately rendered in the Rhemish Version, *do penance*), but it falls far short of the idea of a complete moral change which is described by the Greek *μετανοεῖν*, and it has to do duty (with a slight modification) for a very different word (Matt. xxi. 29, 33; xxvii. 3; Heb. vii. 21, *repent himself*: yet see 2 Cor. vii. 8, *regret*; comp. 2 Cor. vii. 10).

18. Sometimes terms in a series of forms connected in Greek are supplied in English from different roots. Thus we say *righteous*, *righteousness*, *justify*, *justification*. We have indeed the words *just*, and *justice*; but even if we could without loss use "just" for "righteous," we could not substitute "justice" for "righteousness," or "injustice" for "unrighteousness," without introducing great confusion of thought.

So again the close connexion which is often deeply impressive in the original between *faith*, *faithful*, *believe*, *believer*, is necessarily lost (*e.g.* John xx. 27, 29; 1 John v. 4, 5; and for another example, 2 Cor. v. 6, 8).¹

¹ In like manner, it is impossible to mark in a translation the connexion of "Christ" and "Christians" which is emphasised in 2 Cor. i. 21; 1 John ii. 20 ff. (*Χριστός, χριστός, χριστός*).

19. Synonymes offer peculiar difficulties. Greek, for example, distinguishes sharply two types of *love* and two types of *knowledge*, and these distinctions give a power and pathos to the charge of the Risen Lord to St. Peter, which cannot be reproduced in an English translation (John xxi. 15-17). Here the margin directs the careful reader to seek for fuller light; but it would be scarcely possible to adopt this expedient in John xx. 2, compared with xxi. 20, though the use of different words for "love" in the two places has an important bearing on the interpretation of the former verse. Examples of the contrast of the two words for "know," which cannot be expressed in English except by a paraphrase, are of constant occurrence: *e.g.* Mark iv. 13; John xiii. 7; Rom. vi. 6, 9 (compare for another kind of example, Matt. xvi. 9 *ff.*).

So again the phrase "good works" stands necessarily for two distinct phrases, in one of which the word for "good" (*ἀγαθός*) marks the essential moral character of the actions, and in the other (*καλός*) their attractive nobility, as when the word "good" is applied to "the good Shepherd" (Heb. x. 24).

To take examples of a somewhat different kind, the original Greek distinguishes the "weeping" of Jesus by the grave of Lazarus (John xi. 35, *ἐδάκρυσεν* only here), from his "weeping" over Jerusalem (Luke xix. 41, *ἔκλαυσεν*); the one loud cry of the excited multitude (John xviii. 40 *ἐκραύγασαν*), from their reiterated clamour (John xix. 12, *ἔκραζον*); the many different utterances (*ῥήματα*) which are "words of eternal life" (John vi. 68), from the one "word of life," the unchanging Gospel (1 John i. 1); the one abiding mission of the Son from the mission of those sent in His Name (John xx. 21, *ἀπέσταλκα, πέμπω*).¹

¹ It would be easy to multiply examples of synonymes which cannot be distinguished easily and naturally in an English Version. The student will find it worth while to consider a few. *Ἄνθρωπος*: John viii. 40; 1 Tim. ii. 5; Acts ii. 22; xvii. 31—Acts xxi. 39; xxii. 3; but still notice John vi. 10, R.V.

20. So far I have spoken only of questions of vocabulary. Difficulties increase when we take account of grammatical forms and construction.

It is especially in the power of its tenses that Greek is unapproachable by modern languages. A slight change of form in the verb distinguishes at once an action which is inceptive or continuous from one which is complete in idea and execution. Thus when we read in John xix. 2, 3, *The soldiers arrayed Him in a purple garment; and they came unto Him, and said, Hail, King of the Jews!* there is in English no distinction in the verbs; but the Greek, by a simple and most natural change of tense, draws a vivid picture of the stream of soldiers coming one after another to do mock homage to the King once invested in the imperial robe (comp. Acts viii. 17). So again when it is said in Rom. vi. 13, *Neither present your members; . . . but present yourselves unto God, . . .* the distinction marked in the original between the successive acts of sin and the one supreme act of self-surrender which carries all else with it is necessarily lost.

Sometimes the idea of purpose, or of beginning, or of repetition, conveyed by the imperfect, can be expressed simply, *e.g.* :

Matt. iii. 14, *John would have hindered him.*

Luke i. 22, *he continued making signs.*

„ i. 59, *they would have called him* (comp. iv. 42).

„ viii. 23, *they were filling* with water.

„ xviii. 3, *she came oft* unto him.

Acts xxvi. 11, *strove to make* them blaspheme.

And so also the corresponding sense of the present, *e.g.* :

Matt. xxv. 8, *our lamps are going out.*

'Αληθής, ἀληθινός : John xix. 35—1 John ii. 8, etc. Βωμός, θυσιαστήριον : Acts xvii. 23; Luke xi. 51. Λαμβάνειν, παραλαμβάνειν : John i. 11 *f.* Λαός, δῆμος : Acts xii. 4, 11, 22; xvii. 5; xix. 4, 30, 33. Περιελεῖν, ἀφαιρεῖν ἀμαρτίας : Heb. x. 4, 11. Νέος, καινός : Heb. xii. 24; ix. 15—Col. iii. 10; yet notice Matt. ix. 17, R.V. Φίλος, ἑταῖρος : Matt. xxii. 12; xxvi. 50; John xv. 13, 14, 15.

Gal. v. 4, ye who *would be justified* by the law.

Sometimes, as I cannot but think, the Revisers have shrunk too much from an apparent heaviness of rendering, and so lost the full effect of the original. Thus (for example) in Luke xxi. 20, the sign of the desolation of Jerusalem was the gathering of the hosts, and not the complete investment of the city (*being compassed*, not *compassed*); and again in John vii. 37, there is a contrast between the attitude of watchful, expectant waiting (*was standing*) and the sharp, decisive cry which followed. But in very many cases the vividness of the original is unavoidably lost in the translation; and the commentator only can mark it in a paraphrase.¹

21. The Greek article again gives the language a singular power of expressing subtle and significant shades of meaning. Greek, for example, distinguishes clearly between that which has a particular quality and that which presents the type or ideal of the quality under the particular point of

¹ This subject will come before us again (ii. §§ 6, 7). The student will find instructive illustrations in the following passages:—

Matt. viii. 9, *παρεύθῃτι . . . ἔρχου . . .*

„ xvi. 24, *ἀράτω . . . καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω . . .*

„ xxiii. 3, *ποιήσατε . . . καὶ τηρεῖτε.*

„ xxv. 5, *ἐνύσταξαν . . . καὶ ἐκάθευδον.*

„ xxvi. 38, *μείνατε ὧδε καὶ γρηγορεῖτε.*

„ xxvii. 30, *ἔλαβον τὸν κάλαμον καὶ ἔτυπον . . .* (comp. Mark xv. 19).

Mark xiv. 35, *ἐπιπτεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς . . .*

Luke xviii. 13, *ἔτυπτε τὸ στήθος.*

John xi. 29, *ἠγγέρθη . . . καὶ ἤρξατο.*

Acts iv. 31, *ἐπλήσθησαν . . . καὶ ἐλάλουν . . .*

„ xiv. 10, *ἤλατο καὶ περιεπάτει.*

1 Pet. ii. 17, *τιμῆσατε . . . τιμᾶτε . . .*

„ v. 5, *ὑποτάγητε*: Col. iii. 18, *ὑποτάσσεσθε.*

1 Cor. vii. 14, *ἡγιασται.*

„ xi. 23, *παρεδίδοδο.*

Gal. vi. 2, *βαστάζετε . . . ἀναπληρώσατε . . .*

Eph. ii. 22, *συνοικοδομείσθε* (comp. Col. ii. 7, *ἔρριζωμένοι καὶ ἐποικοδομούμενοι*).

„ iv. 22 *f.*, *ἀποθέσθαι . . . φθειρόμενον . . . ἀνανεοῦσθαι . . . ἐνδύσασθαι . . . κτισθέντα . . .*

Phil. ii. 6, *ἠγήσατο.*

2 Tim. iv. 5, *νῆφε . . . κακοπάθησον . . .*

view, the ideal righteousness (for example) towards which men are ever striving (Matt. v. 6, τὴν δικαιοσύνην) and that partial righteousness which in detail embodies it (*id.* 10, δικαιοσύνης); salvation as a state and the salvation which crowned the Divine purpose of love (John iv. 22, ἡ σωτηρία); that which appears under the form of law, and "the law"; and, in another relation, the Son, and Him who is Son (Heb. i. 2). Such differences cannot in many cases be reproduced in English; though it has happened sometimes that the Revisers have failed, through fear of unusual phraseology, to express a turn of thought which might have been expressed (*e.g.* Rom. iii. 21-23).¹

22. So again, while the English idiom commonly specialises a predicative noun, the Greek leaves it simply predicative. Thus we say naturally "he is the shepherd of the sheep," as the one to whom the title belongs, or "a shepherd of the sheep," as one of many; but the Greek emphasises the character, "he is shepherd of the sheep" (John x. 2).

23. Another advantage which is perfectly possessed by Greek is only imperfectly represented in English, that of distinguishing between a predicate which simply defines character and a predicate which is identical with the subject. For example, when we say "*Sin is lawlessness*" (1 John iii. 4), we may mean one of two distinct things: either that sin has this feature of lawlessness among others, or that sin and lawlessness are convertible terms. The Greek admits no ambiguity, and, by presenting sin as identical with violation of law, gives a view of the nature of sin which is of the highest practical importance.

24. In Greek, again, the unemphatic personal pronouns are included in the verbal forms. We cannot, except by

¹ See also Matt. vii. 13, ἡ ἀπώλεια; Luke xviii. 13, τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ; John xii. 24, ὁ κόκκος; xvi. 21, ἡ γυνή; Acts xi. 18, ἡ μετάνοια; xx. 21, ἡ εἰς τὸν Θεὸν μετάνοια; 1 Cor. xi. 3, ἡ κεφαλὴ, ἰκεφαλὴ. On Θεός and ὁ Θεός, see additional note to 1 John iv. 12.

some device of printing, determine whether in the words "*ye think that in them ye have eternal life*" (John v. 39) the emphasis lies upon the false supposition (*ye think*), or upon the character of the people addressed (*ye think*). The Greek, by expressing the pronoun, leaves no doubt. The Lord contrasts the type of Pharisaic character with that of the true disciple; and then in the following clause the full stress can be laid on the want of moral purpose: "*and ye will not come to Me.*"¹

25. Yet once more: the eloquent significance of the original order is often untranslatable (*e.g.* Luke xxii. 48; John iii. 2; Rom. i. 14, 17, 18; vi. 3; 17 Cor. xiv. 12; Heb. i. 5). Sometimes, however, it can be preserved; *e.g.*:

Luke xxii. 33, Lord, *with thee* I am ready. . . .

,, xxiii. 25, but *Jesus* he delivered up. . . .

1 Cor. v. 7, for *our Passover* hath been sacrificed, *even Christ*.

Gal. v. 25, *by the Spirit* let us also walk.

Heb. ii. 9, we behold *Him who hath been made a little lower* than the angels, *even Jesus*.

Heb. xii. 1, therefore *let us also*, seeing we are compassed about. . . .

26. These illustrations, a few taken from an endless number, will show how many questions must present themselves to the translator of the N.T. at every turn. There is not one detail that I have mentioned which a reader would not be glad to have made plain, if it could be done. Not one, I believe, was left unconsidered in the process of revision. And those who have followed me so far will, I think, be prepared to be patient and sympathetic

¹ Other instructive examples are found in Matt. vi. 9; xiii. 18; xxviii. 5; John iv. 38; xi. 49; xii. 20; xv. 16; xviii. 21; Acts iv. 7; 2 Cor. xi. 29; James ii. 3. So also it is impossible in many cases to give the force of *αὐτός* and *ἐκεῖνος* (John xviii. 17), though an attempt has sometimes been made to do so: Matt. i. 21; Acts xx. 35.

critics, both of what has been done, and of what has been left undone. The points raised seem perhaps to be small in themselves: they are not small in their total effect. It is by studying them in their whole range that the reader gains the assurance, that the words of the Bible are living words.

BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT.

THE ORIGIN OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

II. CRITICISM OF RECENT THEORIES.

IN attempting to criticise the theories of which an outline was given in the last paper, it will be enough if we set before ourselves the latest and most complete, that of Dr. Harnack. This has the advantage over the others, that it has appeared since the epoch-making publication of the *Didaché*, and takes full account of that document. In criticising it, we shall be really criticising the rest, which are to a large extent embodied in it.

It will be enough, too, if we follow the lines of the last paper, and single out especially those points which are most open to question. These will be (1) the origin ascribed to the name and office of the *ἐπίσκοπος*, (2) the non-equivalence of the terms *ἐπίσκοπος* and *πρεσβύτερος*, (3) the account that is given of the origin of the more spiritual functions of the Christian ministry, and their gradual transference to the officers who now exercise them.

Among these debateable points there is no reason to include the origin of the diaconate and presbyterate. As to the first, no one seems disposed to question the account given in Acts vi.: and as to the second, we are indebted