

Spirit breathing new life into him, will be trained by Christ for all joyful toil as His slave, and yet His freedman and friend; and at last each once fugitive and unprofitable Onesimus will hear the "Well done, good and faithful servant!"

ALEXANDER MACLAREN,

---

SOME LESSONS OF THE REVISED VERSION OF  
THE NEW TESTAMENT.

III. UNIFORMITIES OF LANGUAGE RESTORED.

1. THE Revisers of the New Testament of 1881 aimed, as we have seen, at the most scrupulous faithfulness. They endeavoured to enable the English reader to follow the correspondences of the original with the closest exactness, to catch the solemn repetition of words and phrases, to mark subtleties of expression, to feel even the strangeness of unusual forms of speech. The Revisers of 1611 adopted and defended a very different mode of procedure. "Another thing," they say in their preface, "we think good to admonish thee of, gentle Reader, that we have not tied ourselves to an uniformity of phrasing, or to an identity of words, as some peradventure would wish that we had done. . . . Truly that we might not vary from the sense of that which we had translated before . . . we were especially careful. . . . But that we should express the same notion in the same particular word; as, for example, if we translate the *Hebrew* or *Greek* word once by *purpose*, never to call it *intent*; . . . if one where *joy*, never *gladness*, etc., thus to mince the matter, we thought to savour more of curiosity than wisdom, and that rather it would

breed scorn in the atheist than bring profit to the godly reader. For is the kingdom of God become words or syllables? . . . We might also be charged (by scoffers) with some unequal dealing towards a great number of good *English* words . . . if we should say, as it were, unto certain words, Stand up higher, have a place in the Bible always; and to others of like quality, Get you hence, be banished for ever; we might be taxed peradventure with *St. James'* words, namely, *To be partial in ourselves, and judges of evil thoughts.* Add hereunto, that niceness in words was always counted the next step to trifling; and so was to be curious about names too. . . ."

2. Now I do not wish to discuss these statements in the abstract. It is easy to imagine cases in which the method of translation here indicated would be not only harmless but even right. We may then put aside the theory in itself, as it is thus stated in justification of the varieties of rendering admitted in the A.V., and simply consider some of the variations themselves. The English student will be perfectly able to judge whether the gain which is secured by such uniformity as the new Revision offers is sufficient to compensate for the disturbance of some familiar rhythms, some graceful turns, in the old Version.

3. The faithful consistency of the Revision, which I desire now to illustrate, is shown in two ways: (1) in the restoration of approximate unity to the rendering of the same words under similar circumstances, when they had been differently rendered in A.V.; and (2) in the distinction of different words which had been left undistinguished in A.V. It is unfaithfulness of the same kind to create differences in a translation which do not exist in the original, and to hide differences which are found in it.

In both respects the arbitrariness of the older English Versions appears to be incapable of any serious or sub-

stantial defence; and the Revisers of 1611 were content in this respect to leave the translation as they found it.

4. The variations in rendering the same original words sometimes extend to whole clauses, and it is difficult to see how the considerations advanced by the "translators" in their preface can apply to such cases. For example, the words of Deut. xxxii. 35 are quoted identically from the LXX. (*Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω*) in Rom. xii. 19 and Heb. x. 30: in the former passage the rendering is, *Vengeance is Mine; I will repay*; and in the latter, *Vengeance belongeth unto Me, I will recompense*. It may be urged that the general sense is the same in the two sentences. Of that I say nothing now; but a careful reader would necessarily suppose that St. Paul and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews had different copies of the Old Testament before them, and might draw important conclusions from the imaginary fact. And what shall we think when even in the same Epistle the same words from Ps. xcv. are translated in one place, *They shall not enter into My rest* (Heb. iii. 11, with a marginal note), and in another place, *If they shall enter into My rest* (iv. 3, without any note)? It is hard to see why the literal rendering of the Hebrew idiom is not given in the first case, if it is allowable in the second case without a margin.

5. The strictest fidelity of rendering is specially necessary in parallel passages. It is well known, for example, that the first three gospels have a large common element, the primitive oral gospel of the Apostles, as I believe, which has been variously modified and supplemented by the several Evangelists to meet the wants of different classes. The English reader has therefore a right to expect that he will find in the version which is placed in his hands a faithful indication of the verbal concordance or difference between the several narratives. These afford the clue, often slender and subtle, to the particular meaning of a

passage. And here at least there is no question of language or style. A rendering which has been once adopted may be repeated.

However obvious this principle may be, it does not appear to have been taken into account in the Revision of 1611; and there can be no doubt that the real relation of the Synoptic Gospels to one another, with all the lessons which follow from the minute differences of the record, have been greatly obscured by the arbitrary discrepancies and concordances to which King James' Revisers gave a place in the A.V.

6. Why, for instance, should the words addressed to Bartimæus, which are the same in the original texts of the two Gospels, be rendered in St. Mark, *Thy faith hath made thee whole* (Mark x. 52, with a marginal note), and in St. Luke, *Thy faith hath saved thee* (Luke xviii. 42)? What shall we say to the almost continuous difference in the renderings of identical phrases, such as the following?—

ST. MARK XII. 38-40.

*Beware of the scribes,  
which love to go in long clothing,  
and love salutations in the market-  
places,  
and the chief seats in the syna-  
gogues,  
and the uppermost rooms at feasts:  
which devour widows' houses,  
and for a pretence make long  
prayers:  
these shall receive greater dam-  
nation.*

ST. LUKE XX. 46 f.

*Beware of the scribes,  
which desire to walk in long robes,  
and love greetings in the markets,  
and the highest seats in the syna-  
gogues,  
and the chief rooms at feasts;  
which devour widows' houses,  
and for a shew make long prayers:  
the same shall receive greater dam-  
nation.<sup>1</sup>*

7. It will of course be said that in this case the general sense is the same in both versions. Whether this is so or not, it is clear that the careful English reader has lost

<sup>1</sup> It may be added, that the Revisers of 1881 have not distinguished the opening verbs, which are different in the two Gospels (*ἀπέχετε, πορεύετε*).

the important fact of the general identity of expression. Sometimes also the sense is seriously affected. If we read in Mark xv. 33 that there was *darkness over the whole land* (without margin), and in Luke xxiii. 44 that *there was a darkness over all the earth* (with margin), we naturally infer that the incident is differently described in the two narratives; and the margin in St. Luke suggests an attempt at reconciliation. The Greek however is absolutely the same in the two places (ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν γῆν).

8. But the offences of the A.V. against consistency are most conspicuous in the treatment of single words; and no changes in R.V. have provoked more hasty criticism than those which were due to the effort of the Revisers to give to the English reader in this respect a faithful reflection of the original.

We can all remember the general cry which was made on the day after the publication of the Revised New Testament, when it was found that in the record of the Passion it was said that *two robbers were crucified with Jesus*. Could there, it was asked, be a more foolish piece of pedantry? At the time it seemed sufficient to ask in reply what the critic proposed to do with the phrase, *Now Barabbas was a robber* (John xviii. 40), where the same original word was correctly rendered in the same connexion. But it may be worth while to notice now how that simple word "robber" (ληστής) appears as a sign of the wild disorder of the times. Aspirations after freedom were used as a cloke for brigandage, as in oppressed nations at all times. Open violence affected to be resistance to foreign oppression. The "robber" is at one end of the scale of dishonest dealers, and the "thief" at the other. The "thief" has his own place in the imagery of Scripture (e.g. 1 Thess. v. 2, 4; 2 Pet. iii. 10; Rev. iii. 3). He is placed side by side with the "robber" in the Lord's condemnation of the false Christs (John x. 1, 8). But in every case where the

“robber” is mentioned in the New Testament, the idea is that of open violence, and not of cunning stealth. The rulers of the people had made the house of God *a den of robbers* (Matt. xxi. 13), as the phrase stands in the Old Testament (Jer. vii. 11); they did not plunder secretly, but used bold extortion and tyranny. The traveller from Jerusalem to Jericho fell among “robbers” (Luke x. 30; comp. 2 Cor. xi. 26), who needed no hidden ambush for the repetition of their crime. And the circumstances of the passion become more vivid and more impressive, when we realise that the “robber”—the false patriot,—one of the *men who in the insurrection had committed murder* (Mark xv. 7), was chosen by the people for release before the true Saviour, and that the penitent “robber,” to whom the Lord dispensed His royal promise from the cross, was one who in his wild life might have had confused thoughts of a kingdom of God, as the final aim of his lawless struggles. The narrative of the betrayal receives a new touch when we hear the Lord’s question in its true form: *Are ye come out as against a robber with swords and staves to seize Me?* (Matt. xxvi. 55, and parallels.) To apprehend a “thief” there would be no need of an armed force.

9. It is not, I suppose, seriously argued now, that in this case consistency of rendering is not a clear gain. We have grown familiar with the thought and the rhythm. But many feel still a natural regret that the word “charity” has no place in the R.V. The word was deliberately retained in some passages of the A.V., and especially in 1 Cor. xiii., on the ground of its ecclesiastical associations, though the word so rendered (*ἀγάπη*), was more than three times as often rendered “love.” Charity is indeed a word of most touching sweetness. It can never lose its position in the vocabulary of Christian graces. But to retain it in the New Testament is to hide the source of its strength and glory. No one, as far as I am aware, ever proposed to

adopt into our English Version the Latin rendering, "Deus est caritas," *God is charity*, which stands in the Rhemish translation; and yet no loss to Christian morality could be greater than the separation of the grace from its Divine archetype. The strength of the Christian character lies in the truth that he who has love shares according to his measure in the Divine nature. Thus by using in English different words to express the relation of God to man and of man to men, calling the one "love" and the other "charity," where the original Scriptures use one word only to describe in this aspect the relations of God to man, and of man to God, and of man to man, we weaken the bond which unites the human and Divine, we remove the revelation of that harmony which exists, according to the idea of creation, between man made in the image of God and God Himself. It is still further of great importance that "charity" has no corresponding verb. We cannot express in terms of charity, so to speak, St. John's words: "*Beloved, if God so loved us, we also ought to love one another. . . . God is love; and he that abideth in love abideth in God, and God abideth in him* (1 John iv. 11-16).<sup>1</sup> And when we say "God is love" (1 John iv. 16), and "charity never faileth" (1 Cor. xiii. 8), we have lost the connexion between the two thoughts; we have lost, that is, a link which unites by an essential bond the teaching of St. John and St. Paul.

Am I not then right in believing that when once the facts are seen in their fulness, the English reader will recognise his gain in having the greatest of human graces indissolubly connected with the very being of God, and seen to be eternal because He is eternal.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It will be interesting to compare the Rhemish Version. *My dearest, if God so loved us, we also ought to love one another. . . . God is charity, and he that abideth in charity, abideth in God, and God in him.*

<sup>2</sup> An examination of all the passages in which "charity" (A.V.) has been replaced by "love" (R.V.) is instructive: 1 Cor. viii. 1; xiii. ; xiv. 1; xvi. 14

10. The two signal examples of restored unities of rendering which have just been given are evidently fitted to arrest and to keep attention. They illustrate conspicuously two typical classes of similar changes. The one gives back to us the true sense of the outward setting, so to speak, of the apostolic history; the other lays open a deeper view of Christian truth. In other cases the lesson which flows from uniformity in rendering may easily be overlooked. But even so the effect, if it be less striking, is not to be neglected. Sometimes, for example, the repetition of an identical phrase gives to a statement a pathetic emphasis, which is destroyed by difference of rendering. No one, I think, can fail to feel (dare I say so?) the music of the words of the Baptist as they stand now in John iii. 31, in exact conformity with the original: *He that is of the earth is of the earth* (not *is earthly*), *and of the earth he speaketh*. And the correction involves more than an altered rhythm. *Earthly* stands in the same chapter for a different word (*ἐπίγειος*) and a different idea (v. 12).

So it is that very frequently the solemn repetition of one word fixes attention on the central thought of the writer, and materially helps to its interpretation. A patient English student will feel what he gains by the faithful representation of St. Paul's language in the recurrence of *reckoned* in Rom. iv. 3-8; of *abolished* in 1 Cor. xv. 24, 26; of *subjected* (*subject*) in 1 Cor. xv. 28; of *affliction* (*afflict*) and *comfort* in 2 Cor. i. 4-8; of *made manifest* in 2 Cor. v. 10, 11; of *glory*, 2 Cor. xi. 16 ff; of *comfort* in 2 Thess. ii. 16 f; and of St. John's characteristic words, *witness* in John i. 7 ff, 19 ff; viii. 13-18; of *judgment* in John v. 22-29.<sup>1</sup>

11. In the majority of cases the repetition of the same (comp. v. 24); Col. iii. 14 (comp. ii. 2); 1 Thess. iii. 6 (comp. v. 12); 2 Thess. i. 3 (comp. 1 Thess. i. 3); 1 Tim. i. 5 (comp. v. 14), ii. 15, iv. 12 (comp. vi. 11); 2 Tim. ii. 22; iii. 10; Tit. ii. 2; 1 Pet. iv. 8, v. 14; 2 Pet. i. 7; 3 John 6; Rev. ii. 19.

<sup>1</sup> Sometimes a correspondence has been left unmarked; e.g. John xi. 19, 31.



word in the same context is essential to the full expression of the thought or argument. No one, after a little patient thought, can miss the force or pathos of the original form of expression in the following passages, which had been neglected in A.V. and have now been restored.

Matt. xxiii. 12 (comp. Luke xiv. 11; xviii. 14), *Whosoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled* (A.V. abased); and *whosoever shall humble himself shall be exalted*. There is an absolute correspondence between the Divine retribution and the human action. Perhaps the words offer a glimpse of the working of the chastisements of God. Matt. xxv. 46, *These shall go away into eternal* (A.V. everlasting) *punishment: but the righteous into eternal life*. The issues of our conduct, both bad and good, are shown in relation to the same unseen order, and as answering to its laws (comp. 2 Cor. iv. 18).<sup>1</sup>

Mark xii. 41 f: *He beheld how the multitude cast money into the treasury: and many that were rich cast in much. And there came a poor widow, and she cast* (A.V. threw) *in two mites. . . .* The identity of the outward form of the acts is an important point in the narrative.

Mark xiii. 12: *Brother shall deliver up brother to death, and the father his child* (A.V. son); and *children shall rise up against parents. . . .* The repetition of the word which expresses the natural relation deepens the gloom of the picture.<sup>2</sup>

Luke xi. 33 f: *No man, when he hath lighted a lamp, (A.V. candle) putteth it . . . under the bushel, but on the stand, that they which enter in may see the light. The lamp (A.V. light) of thy body is thine eye: when thine eye is single, thy whole body also is full of light.* It is essential to

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Matt. iv. 20, 22; xiii. 20 f (*straightway*, four renderings in A.V.); xviii. 33 (*had mercy*); xx. 20 (*sons*); xxi. 25 (*from*); xxii. 2 f (*marriage-feast*); xxiii. 16, 18 (*is a debtor*); xxv. 32 (*separate, separateth*).

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Mark iii. 5 (*stretch forth, stretched forth*); v. 27 f (*garment, garments*); v. 38 f (*tumult*); vi. 35 (*far spent*); x. 13 f (*little children*).

the understanding of the passage that there should be a distinction between the organ through which the illumination is given and the light itself (comp. Matt. vi. 22; John v. 35; 2 Pet. i. 19; Rev. xxii. 5).<sup>1</sup>

John vi. 27 f: Work (A.V. labour) *not for the meat which perisheth. . . . They said therefore unto Him, What must we do, that we may work the works of God?* The question takes up the word of the Lord.

John xv. 26 f: *The Spirit of truth . . . shall bear witness (A.V. testify): . . . and ye also bear witness. . . .* The twofold witness must be regarded in its common features (comp. Acts v. 32).<sup>2</sup>

Acts xxvi. 24 f: *Festus saith with a loud voice, Paul, thou art mad (A.V. beside thyself). . . . But Paul saith, I am not mad, most excellent Festus. . . .* The correspondence is exact in the original (*μαίην, οὐ μαίνομαι*), and the intervening words must not be allowed to obscure it.<sup>3</sup>

Rom. xv. 4, 5: *Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written . . . that through patience and through comfort of the Scriptures we might have hope. Now the God of patience and of comfort (A.V. consolation) grant you. . . .* The very point of the prayer lies in the fact that the living God is the one source of the characteristic blessings which come through His word.

This appeal to the nature of God is seen even in a more striking form a little later on in the same chapter.

Rom. xv. 12, 13: *There shall be the Root of Jesse; . . . on Him shall the Gentiles hope (A.V. trust). Now the God of hope fill you with all joy, . . . that ye may abound in*

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Luke ii. 4 (*called*); v. 3 f (*put out*); vii. 33 f (*is come*); ix. 28, 37 (*the mountain*); xvii. 21, 23 (*Lo, here*); xviii. 25 (*enter*); xix. 13, 15 (*trade here-with, gained by trading*); xxii. 8 f (comp. 12 f, *make ready*); xxiv. 29 (*abide*).

<sup>2</sup> Comp. John i. 39 (*abode*); ii. 8 f (*ruler of the feast*); iii. 2, 10 (*teacher*); iii. 11 (*bear witness, witness*); iii. 12 (*told you, tell you*); viii. 33 ff (*bondage, bondservant*); ix. 19, 21 (*how*); xv. 2, 4, 5 (*bear*); xv. 9 f (*abide*); xx. 25 (*put*).

<sup>3</sup> Comp. Acts xvii. 18, 23 (*set forth*); xix. 24 f (*business*); xxi. 39 f (*give leave*); xxiii. 25, 33 (*letter*); xxvii. 10, 21 (*injury, loss*).

hope. . . . The God of revelation, the God of the Covenant, can alone inspire and support this expectation of a world-wide gospel.<sup>1</sup>

1 Cor. iii. 17: *If any man destroyeth* (A.V. defile) *the temple of God, him shall God destroy.* The punishment is the exact correlative of the offence (comp. 2 Cor. v. 10; Col. iii. 25, marg.; 2 Pet. ii. 12 f, R.V.).

1 Cor. xii. 4 ff: *There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are diversities* (A.V. differences) *of ministrations, and the same Lord. And there are diversities of workings* (A.V. operations), *but the same God, who worketh all things in all.* In such a description of the Divine action, it is obviously of the highest importance to preserve the uniformity of St. Paul's language.

Gal. ii. 8 f: *He that wrought* (A.V. adds "effectually") *for Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision wrought* (A.V. the same was mighty) *for me also unto the Gentiles; and . . . they . . . gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles* (A.V. heathen), *and they unto the circumcision.* The two arbitrary variations in A.V. mar the symmetry of the picture which St. Paul draws of the twofold apostolic endowment and mission.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Rom. i. 19 (*manifest, manifested*); ii. 2 f (*practise*); v. 2, 3, 11 (*rejoice, Gk. glory*); vii. 7, 8 (*covet, coveting*); xi. 22 f (*continue*); xv. 19 (*power*); xvi. 3, 5 ff, 11 (*salute*); xvi. 3, 9, 21 (*fellow-worker*).

<sup>2</sup> Comp. 1 Cor. i. 19 (*prudence, prudent*); ii. 14 f (*judged, judgeth*); vii. 16 (*how*); ix. 22 (*become, am become*); x. 16, 18, 20 (*communion, have communion, contrast partake*); xiii. 8, 10, 11 (*done away, put away*); xvi. 1 f (*collection, collections*).

2 Cor. ii. 3 ff (*sorrow, made sorry, caused sorrow*); v. 6, 8, 9 (*[to be] at home*); vii. 9, 11 (*made sorry*); x. 4 f, 8 (*casting down*); xii. 3 (*know not, knoweth*); xii. 9 (*weakness, weaknesses*).

Gal. iii. 22 f (*shut up*); iv. 8 f (*[to be] in bondage*).

Eph. v. 15 (*unwise, wise*).

Phil. i. 4 (*supplication*); ii. 13 (*worketh, to work*); iii. 4 (*have confidence*).

Col. ii. 13 (*trespasses*).

1 Tim. i. 15 f (*chief*); ii. 7 (*truth*).

2 Tim. iii. 8 (*withstood, withstand*).

In Heb. xii. the full force of a quotation from the Old Testament is twice lost by failure to preserve the significant word in the application :

v. 5 : *Ye have forgotten the exhortation, which reasoneth with you as with sons (A.V. children), My son, regard not lightly the chastening of the Lord. . . .*

vv. 27 f : *This word, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, . . . that those things which are not shaken may remain. Wherefore, receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken (A.V. moved), let us have grace. . . .*<sup>1</sup>

1 Pet. ii. 4 f : *Unto whom coming, a living stone, . . . ye also, as living (A.V. lively) stones, are built up a spiritual house. . . .* The wholly unwarranted change of rendering obscures the thought of the relation of the Head to the members, to borrow St. Paul's image.

1 John v. 18 f : *We know that whosoever is begotten of God sinneth not; but He that was begotten of God keepeth him, and the evil one (A.V. that wicked one) toucheth him not. We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in the evil one (A.V. wickedness). The "world" is "in the evil one," even as believers are "in Christ" (comp. John xvii. 15).*<sup>2</sup>

12. In most of the passages which have been hitherto noticed, an identical rendering has been restored to a word variously translated by A.V. in the same context. Very frequently the variation occurs in passages widely scattered. But it is no less important in these cases also to preserve the identity which discloses to the careful student a fresh sign of the clear precision of view which marks the apostolic writings.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Heb. xi. 27, 28, 29 (*by faith*); xi. 35 (*resurrection*).

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Jas. i. 4 f (*lacking, lacketh*); ii. 2 f (*clothing*).

1 Pet. i. 7, 13 (*revelation*); iii. 14 (*fear*).

1 John ii. 24 (*abide*); iii. 12 (*evil*); 3 John 14 (*salute*).

Rev. xiii. 13 f (*signs*); xviii. 2 (*unclean*); xx. 3, 5, 7 (*finished*); xx. 13 (*gave up*); xxi. 18 (*pure*).

Thus, to take an illustration from a single book. One word in the Revelation (*θρόνος*), variously rendered in A.V. by "throne" and "seat," conveys in the original a far-reaching vision of the spiritual order, which is wholly obliterated by the diversity of translation. *I know where thou dwellest*, is the message to the angel of the Church of Pergamum, *even where Satan's throne* (A.V. seat) *is: and thou holdest fast My name . . .* (Rev. ii. 13). There is a kingdom of the evil one upon earth; and a brute force which represents its power: *The dragon gave [the beast] his power, and his throne* (A.V. seat), *and great authority* (Rev. xiii. 2). But it is doomed to overthrow: *The fifth [angel] poured out his bowl upon the throne* (A.V. seat) *of the beast; and his kingdom was darkened* (Rev. xvi. 10). Meanwhile the prospect is opened of a sovereignty of the saints. They are allowed to share the royal dignity of their Lord in their representatives: *Round about the throne were four and twenty thrones* (A.V. seats): *and upon the thrones* (A.V. seats) *I saw four and twenty elders sitting, arrayed in white garments; and on their heads crowns of gold* (Rev. iv. 4). And when the proclamation was made, *The kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord, and of His Christ, . . . the four and twenty elders, which sit before God on their thrones* (A.V. seats), *fell upon their faces, and worshipped God . . .* (Rev. xi. 15, 16. Comp. Matt. xix. 28).

More commonly the correspondences must be traced through several books. A remarkable verb, for example (*ἀπεκδέχομαι*), is used, and used exclusively, with one exception, of the attitude of the Christian towards the future revelation of the Lord. This is rendered in A.V. five times "wait for," and twice "look for." It is obviously a clear gain to conform these two last passages (Phil. iii. 20, Heb. ix. 28) to the others; but no one, till he had learnt the facts, could rightly understand the reason for the change.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sometimes the form of association was strong enough to resist a required

So again St. Paul uses a characteristic verb (*καταλλάσσειν*), and the derivative noun (*καταλλαγή*), to express the establishment of the right relation between God and man. The verb is uniformly rendered "reconcile"; the noun, which occurs four times, has three renderings, "reconciliation" (2 Cor. v. 18, 19), "atonement" (Rom. v. 11), "reconciling" (Rom. xi. 15). Faithfulness requires a single translation, and the word "reconciliation" is in every way an appropriate equivalent of the Greek. It is the more important to fix the use of the form "reconciliation" because it has been wrongly used in Heb. ii. 17 (A.V.) to express a totally different root (*ἰλάσκεσθαι, ἰλασμός*), which is elsewhere rightly expressed by "propitiation."

13. The last illustration shows the necessity of preserving, if possible, a corresponding translation through a group of kindred words. We have seen already how important is the application of this principle to the group of words connected with "love." It has an illustration also from the words expressing "fear." No one can fail to catch at once the difference between "fear" and "fearfulness," the fact and the temper. When therefore the adjective (*δειλός*) is most happily rendered "fearful" (Matt. viii. 26, Mark iv. 40, Rev. xxi. 8), it is desirable to represent the same thought in the noun, "fearfulness" (2 Tim. i. 7), and in the verb, "to be fearful" (John xiv. 27).<sup>1</sup>

14. A familiar title will furnish another illustration. The Aramaic Rabbi is sometimes given in the Gospels in its original form, and sometimes by the Greek equivalent rendered "Master" (or "Teacher"). The retention of the

conformity. For example in Luke xxii. 20 we read *poured out*, but in Matthew xxvi. 28 *shed* was retained, the different connexion being supposed to justify the retention of the familiar word. Nor did the American Company dissent from this conclusion.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Acts iv. 36, xi. 23 (*son of exhortation, exhorted*); Col. ii. 9 f (*fulness, made full*); 1 Thess. ii. 4 (*approved, proveth*); 2 Thess. ii. 16 f (*gave us comfort, comfort*); 2 Tim. iii. 17 (*complete, furnished completely*).

Aramaic word may indicate something as to the sources of the particular narratives, or perhaps give a touch of personal feeling to the address; but in any case, it is desirable to preserve in the English Version a feature which can be made as clear as in the Greek. So it is that *Rabbi* has been introduced in Matthew xxvi. 25, 49; Mark ix. 5, xi. 21, xiv. 45; as it was already given in A.V. in Matthew xxiii. 7, 8.

The common title received a fuller form, as expressive of higher respect, in the unusual form *Rabboni* (*Rabbuni*), which is found twice in the Gospels. This was simply rendered "Lord" in Mark x. 51, and the interpretation given in St. John (xx. 16) is "Master." The two passages are now brought into harmony; and some will be inclined to see more than an accidental coincidence in the use (and the record of the use) of the peculiar form on these two occasions.

15. The changes which have been noticed so far were made with the view of bringing the different parts of the New Testament into harmony. One other series of changes was made to bring out the connexion between the Old and New Testaments more clearly. The familiar forms of the Old Testament names are given by the R.V. in place of the Græcised forms of A.V., when a person or place known in the Old Testament is referred to in the New Testament. The misunderstanding which has been caused by the use of the Greek form *Jesus* for *Joshua* in two places (Acts vii. 45; Heb. iv. 8) is known to every one; and such forms as *Osee*, *Elias*, *Sarepta*, are puzzling to many readers, though in a less degree. Where the old form has a distinct English equivalent, as *James*, it seemed well to notice the original (*Jacob*) in the margin.

16. In a few cases a coincidence of language in the original has been noticed in the margin, when an identical rendering was not accepted for the text. The most remark-

able example is furnished by the treatment of the word which is now almost naturalised among us as "Paraclete." As applied to the Holy Spirit in the Gospel of St. John this is rendered "Comforter," and as applied to the Son in St. John's first Epistle, "Advocate." In each case a note is added (John xiv. 17, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7; 1 John ii. 1), which brings the identity of the original term clearly before the reader. So again, a peculiar word (ἐξόδος) is rendered closely "departure," and a marginal note records this sense in the two other places in which it is found (Luke ix. 31; 2 Pet. i. 15).<sup>1</sup>

The illustrations which have been given are of very unequal interest. Some include changes of great importance; others may appear to be trifling. Some are obvious; others are required by considerations which spring from careful study. But no one, I believe, will question that they are required by faithfulness; that they give fresh vigour and meaning to the apostolic words when they are allowed to have their full weight; that any disturbance of familiar phrases is far more than balanced by the fuller expression of the original message. And, so far, it may be added, no change has been noted which involves alteration of the "received" Greek text.

B. F. WESTCOTT.

---

*THE GERMAN AND THE ANGLO-AMERICAN  
REVISIONS OF THE BIBLE.*

WE live in an age of revision and reconstruction, which will probably be followed by a new reformation. The modern progress of discovery and research in Biblical learning in Protestant countries is so great, that it imperatively demands a revision of the translations made in the sixteenth

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Acts iii. 15; Heb. ii. 10, xii. 2.