

SOME LESSONS OF THE REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

IV. DIFFERENCES OF LANGUAGE MARKED.

1. THE representation of differences of expression in the original Greek, often subtle and yet significant, which had been neglected in the A.V. was no less important for the faithfulness of the Revision than the removal of differences which A.V. had introduced, or retained from the earlier Bibles. In endeavouring to satisfy this claim the Revisers had to face the difficult question of Greek synonymes (*Introd.* § 19); and if it was found impossible in some cases to convey to the English reader simply and sharply the shades of thought given by the original terms, yet, for the most part, his attention could be turned in the right direction. He would be aroused to seek for further light. A few illustrations from different classes of words will show how far success was attained in this respect.

2. Three verbs in Greek are rendered, and sometimes necessarily and not inadequately rendered, by the substantive verb *to be*; but they could not be interchanged in the original text without a distinct modification of the sense of the passages in which they occur. One of the words (*ὑπάρχειν*) is comparatively rare, and has no English equivalent.¹ The two others (*εἶναι, γίνεσθαι*), roughly represented by *to be* and *to become*, are very common.

¹ The verb is characteristic of the Pauline group of writings. Instructive examples of its use occur: Luke xi. 13, xvi. 14, 23, xxiii. 50; Acts ii. 30, iii. 2, iv. 34, viii. 16, xvii. 24; Rom. iv. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 7; Phil. ii. 6 marg., iii. 20 (2 Pet. iii. 11).

It was therefore necessary to consider, especially when these verbs stood in near connexion, whether their exact force could be suggested without a cumbrous paraphrase. Not unfrequently the problem was insoluble, or it appeared that the context sufficiently implied the idea of results reached (*e.g.* Luke xx. 14, *be ours* ; Gal. iii. 24, *hath been our tutor* ; Heb. ii. 17, *that He might be . . .*). In other cases the original Greek found a fair expression in English. Thus we read :

John xii. 36, *Believe on the light, that ye may become (not be) sons of light* (comp. i. 12).

Acts iv. 4, *The number of men came to be (not was) (comp. ii. 41) about five thousand.*

1 Cor. iii. 18, *If any man thinketh that he is wise among you in this world, let him become a fool, that he may become (by this very change, not be) wise.*

1 Cor. vii. 23, *Ye were bought with a price ; become not (for be not) bondservants of men.*

2 Cor. iii. 7 f, *If the ministration of death . . . came with glory (not was glorious) : . . . how shall not rather the ministration of the spirit be (the verb is changed) with glory ?*

2 Tim. iii. 9, *Their folly shall be evident, . . . as theirs also came to be (not was).*

1 Pet. iv. 12, *The fiery trial among you, which cometh upon you to prove you.*

2 Pet. i. 4, . . . *that through these ye may become partakers of the Divine nature.*¹

In all these examples the reader will perceive, with a little reflection, how much the words gain in living force by the distinct suggestion of progress, movement, change, which lies in the original word, and is now reflected in the R.V.

In the same way the question in the parable of the good

¹ Comp. Matt. xxiii. 26, xxiv. 32, xxvii. 24 ; John i. 6, viii. 58 marg. ; Acts viii. 1, xv. 25 ; Heb. ii. 2, vi. 20 ; Rev. i. 18 marg., ii. 8 marg.

Samaritan receives fresh point by the more exact translation. *Which of these three, thinkest thou, proved (not was) neighbour unto him that fell among the robbers?* (Luke x. 36.) The point at issue was not the essential being, but the practical manifestation of character. The lesson of the progressive deterioration of the moral nature in the absence of the Divine Spirit is preserved in Matt. xii. 45 by the Revised rendering, *The last state of that man becometh (not is) worse than the first.*

3. In other passages the same form of rendering ("become") guards the expression of the great principle of a Divine counsel, a "law," fulfilled in the course of things, which had been obscured by the too specific translation ("is made") of A.V. Thus the Lord declares that He "came into the world" *that they which see may become (not be made) blind* (John ix. 39) by the action of forces already at work within them. And in the announcement of the central fact of the faith we feel the presence of an eternal purpose wrought out in Him when we read *the Word became flesh (for was made flesh)* (John i. 12); and again, *the first man Adam became a living soul: the last Adam became a life-giving spirit* (1 Cor. xv. 45).¹

The importance of the thought thus indicated is seen in another connexion in 2 Cor. v. 21, where "being made" and "becoming" are set in contrast, though the difference was lost in A.V.: *Him who knew no sin He made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become (not be made) the righteousness of God in Him.* The transformation of the believer follows from his vital union with God in Christ.

4. It was far more easy to suggest to the English reader the shades of thought represented by the different Greek words answering to "to be" than of those answering to "to know." Three words clearly distinct in conception (*εἰδέναι, γινώσκειν, ἐπίστασθαι*) are commonly, and for the most part

¹ See also Rom. vii. 13; 2 Cor. iii. 7 f; Heb. i. 4.

necessarily, so translated.¹ Of these, two are very common (*εἰδέναι, γινώσκειν*), one of which (*εἰδέναι*) describes, so to speak, a direct mental vision, knowledge which is at once immediate and complete; and the other (*γινώσκειν*) a knowledge which moves from point to point, springing out of observation and experience. The third word (*ἐπίστασθαι*) is much rarer, and expresses the knowledge which comes from close and familiar acquaintance. It will be evident that in many cases nothing but a paraphrase could convey the precise meaning of the original. Elsewhere the context gives the appropriate colour to the general term (*know*). In some places however it seemed desirable to mark the contrast when two of the words were placed in close connexion. Thus in John iii. 10, 11 there is a contrast between the absolute knowledge of the Lord and that power of recognising truth which an accredited master might be expected to possess; and thus R.V. gives, in strict conformity with the Greek, *Art thou the teacher of Israel, and understandest (A.V. knowest) not these things? Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that we do know. . . .* So again we see a little more of the meaning of the words by which the Lord replies to the impetuous question with which St. Peter met His offer of lowly service, when we read in R.V., *What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt understand (A.V. know) hereafter*, taught in the solemn school of apostolic work (John xiii. 7).² In one or two places the substitution of *learn* for *know* (*γινώσκειν*) adds to the narrative the touch of life which belongs to the progress of events; as when it is said, on the eve of the triumphal entry in Jerusalem, that *the common people of*

¹ A fourth word (*συνέειναι*), which expresses an intelligence of the meaning of that which is said and done, was generally and adequately rendered in A.V. by *understand*; and this rendering has been given in the two passages where it was otherwise translated, Mark vi. 52, 2 Cor. x. 12.

² It is, I think, to be regretted that the distinction was not made in Mark iv. 13; Heb. viii. 11; 1 John ii. 19. Comp. Acts xix. 15 marg.

the Jews learned (A.V. knew) *that [Jesus] was [at Bethany]* . . . (John xii. 9). The phrase suggests the idea of lively interest and inquiry, which prepare for what followed.¹ There is a similar vividness in the use of *perceive*; the disciples perceived (A.V. knew) *not the things that were said* when the Lord spoke of His passion (Luke xviii. 34); they could not read the signs before them.² The use of this word (*perceive*) of the Lord emphasises a trait in His perfect humanity. Looking on the anxious faces of the disciples He perceived (A.V. knew) *that they were desirous to ask Him* . . . (John xvi. 19).³

5. Sometimes, as we have already seen, a slight variation in language suggests a far-reaching thought. Life, for example, has a twofold aspect, the outward and the inward. We move in a visible order, and we move also in an invisible order. We have duties in regard to both. St. Paul fixes our attention on the truth by a significant change of verb in Rom. xii. 2, which has been represented in the R.V. : *Be not fashioned*, he says—"fashioned," that is, in your external character and bearing—*according to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind* . . . in that which is essential and eternal. The difference which is thus indicated to the attentive student was happily preserved by A.V. in the important passage Phil. ii. 6, 8, *Christ Jesus being in the form of God . . . taking the form of a servant and being found in fashion as a man . . . humbled Himself* . . . And now it has been also marked in the remaining passages where the words are found: 2 Cor. xi. 13 ff; Phil. iii. 21.

6. There is again a most significant progress in man's opposition to the truth, which is greatly obscured in A.V. First comes the simple absence of belief (*οὐ πιστεύειν*); this

¹ Comp. Mark xv. 45.

² Comp. Mark xii. 12, xv. 10; Luke vii. 39, ix. 11; Acts xix. 34.

³ Comp. Mark v. 30.

is followed by disbelief (*ἀπιστεῖν*); and at last disbelief issues practically in disobedience (*ἀπειθεῖν*). Thus we are able to follow a natural moral movement when we read in the record of the appearances of the risen Lord, that the disciples "disbelieved" the first tidings of Mary Magdalene, and "believed not" the later statements which came to them (Mark xvi. 11, 13). So also "disbelief," and not absence of belief, is the ground of men's condemnation (Mark xvi. 16; comp. Acts xxviii. 24); and the English reader can enter now more fully than before into the meaning of St. John's words when he reads, *He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but he that obeyeth not (not believeth not) the Son shall not see life* (John iii. 36). The same change gives a fresh touch to the portraiture of the adversaries of St. Paul at Ephesus, where, we now read, *some were hardened and disobedient* (A.V. believed not: Acts xix. 9; comp. Rom. xv. 31). These gainsayers of the truth felt the authority of the teaching which they opposed.¹

¹ Comp. Rom. xi. 30-32; Heb. iii. 18, iv. 6, 11, xi. 31.

One most important group of words, rendered in A.V. *repent, repentance* (*μετανοεῖν, μετάνοια, μεταμέλεσθαι*), offered great difficulties in translation. The first two Greek words (*μετανοεῖν, μετάνοια*) describe characteristically in the language of the N.T. a general change of mind, which becomes in its fullest development an intellectual and moral regeneration; the latter (*μεταμέλεσθαι*) expresses a special relation to the past, a feeling of regret for a particular action which may be deepened to remorse. It was of paramount importance to keep one rendering for the former words, which are key-words of the gospel, and it was impossible to displace *repent, repentance*, which, though originally inadequate, are capable of receiving the full meaning of the original. No one satisfactory term could be found for *μεταμέλεσθαι*. In the passage where it occurs in the same context with *μετάνοια*, it has been adequately rendered by *regret* (2 Cor. vii. 8 ff); and elsewhere the limited application of the feeling has been indicated by the reflexive rendering *repent oneself* (never *repent* absolutely): Matt. xxi. 29, 32, xxvii. 3; Heb. vii. 21. Yet *without repentance* (*ἀμεταμέλητος*), Rom. xi. 29, is unchanged. Dr. T. Walden has expounded the apostolic force of *μετάνοια* with great power and truth in an essay on *The Great Meaning of the word Metanoia, lost in the Old Version, unrecovered in the New* (New York, 1882); but he has overlooked the fact that the idea of *repentance*, like that of *μετάνοια* itself, can be transfigured by Christian use, and that the force of words is not limited by their etymology.

7. In these examples we can see how the R.V. has accurately preserved traits in man's attitude of opposition to God. It has also carefully distinguished the two distinct forms in which the apostolic writers have presented our filial connexion with Him. There is the position of "sonship" (characteristic of the teaching of St. Paul), which suggests the thoughts of privilege, of inheritance, of dignity; and there is also the position of "childship" (characteristic of the teaching of St. John), which suggests the thoughts of community of nature, of dependence, of tender relationship. Sons may be adopted; children can only be born. The two conceptions are evidently complementary; but they must be realised separately before the full force of the whole idea which they combine to give can be felt. The English reader has now, for the first time, the materials for the work. Yet even here it was felt to be impossible to change the phrase, "the children of Israel," for "the sons of Israel," though the exact phrase has a clear significance (contrast 1 Pet. iii. 6). With this exception (and one accidental omission of the mark of reference in Matt. xxi. 28 1°), I believe that the use of "child" ("children") is always marked in the R.V.; and that with the clearest gain to the natural feeling of the narrative (Mark ii. 5; Matt. ix. 2; Luke xv. 31, xvi. 25; Matt. xxi. 28) and address (1 Cor. iv. 14; 1 Tim. i. 2, 28; Tit. i. 4, etc.), no less than to the exact definition of spiritual relations. On the other hand, the grand title, "sons of God," holds its true place, according to the exact usage of the original.

Two or three illustrations will be sufficient to indicate the gain to the student of Scripture from the faithful preservation of this distinction between the general conceptions of a Divine inheritance and a Divine nature. Thus we now read that the Lord gave to them that received Him *the right to become children* (A.V. sons) *of God, which were*

born . . . of God (John i. 12). And again: *Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called children (A.V. the sons) of God: and such we are* (1 John iii. 1 f). So, conversely, in other places the title of privilege is restored to the English text. *They that are accounted worthy to attain to that world . . . are equal unto the angels, and are sons (A.V. the children) of God, being sons of the resurrection* (Luke xx. 35). *Where it was said unto them, Ye are not My people, there shall they be called sons (A.V. the children) of the living God* (Rom. ix. 26).¹

8. If we carry our thoughts still further to that unseen and future order, of which with our present powers we can form no definite conception, we find the R.V. has distinguished between *hell* (*γέεννα*), the place of suffering, and *hades*, the place of spirits (the unbounded, *sheol*) (see Matt. xvi. 18; Luke xvi. 23; Acts ii. 27; Rev. i. 18). It has also adequately presented the most characteristic claim of the gospel, which was obliterated before, in the familiar phrase that Christ *brought life and immortality to light through the gospel* (2 Tim. i. 10, A.V.); whereas we now read that He *brought life and incorruption to light*. The revelation of the resurrection is *incorruption* (*ἀφθαρσία*), the preservation of all that belongs to the fulness of humanity (comp. Rom. ii. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 42, 50, 54, A.V.), and not simple continuance of being. Immortality (*ἀθανασία*) is a separate idea (1 Cor. xv. 53 f; 1 Tim. vi. 16), which falls far short of the completeness of assurance which comes through the revelation of the risen Lord.

9. The importance of preserving an unusual phrase may be shown by an example of a different kind, where a peculiar word gives the clue to the understanding of the real course of apostolic thought. • One of the most decisive steps

¹ Compare Matt. v. 9, 45; Luke vi. 35; Gal. iii. 26. See also Exod. xiii. 13, 15 (R.V.).

in the historic interpretation of the work and person of Christ was the perception that in Him was fulfilled the prophecy of the "servant of the Lord" (*παῖς Κυρίου*, Isa. lii. ff), which fact is clearly marked in the early chapters of the Acts. In the A.V. the fact was wholly hidden by the adoption of the translation "child" or "son" for "servant" (Acts iii. 13, 26; iv. 27, 30). Now the careful reader cannot fail to observe how the meaning of Isaiah's teaching was brought home by the Spirit to the Apostles, and through this the real significance of the sufferings of Christ.¹

10. So far the illustrations have been taken from words which are of frequent occurrence. In the A.V. of Rom. iii. 25 the confusion of a word, which is found there only in the N.T. (*πάρεσις*), with another common word from the same root (*ἄφεσις*) has led to the complete inversion of St. Paul's meaning. The sins of former time were neither forgiven nor punished: they were simply passed over; and for this reason there was need of the vindication of the righteousness of God, *because of the passing over of the sins done aforesaid, in the forbearance of God*, and not (as A.V.) *for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God*. The distinction between the unique words *divinity* (*θειότης*, Rom. i. 20) and *Godhead* (*deity*, *θεότης*, Col. ii. 9) is not less important.² And under this head reference may be made to the care taken by the Revisers to represent words of a single occurrence in the original by words of single occurrence in the English version. A considerable number of the novelties of language are due to this necessary endeavour; and a student who has the patience to work through the following examples will gain a new sense of the richness of the apostolic vocabulary, which has been hidden in A.V.³ *Apparition* (*φάν-*

¹ Compare Luke i. 54 (Israel), i. 69; Acts iv. 25 (David). See also Matt. xii. 18.

² Compare Acts xvii. 29 marg. (*τὸ θεῖον*).

³ The words quoted occur, I believe, in the Greek and English texts of the

τασμα, Matt. xiv. 26, Luke vi. 49) ; *awe* (δέος, Heb. xii. 28) ; *billows* (σάλος, Luke xxi. 25) ; *concealed* (παρακαλύπτεσθαι, Luke ix. 45) ; *conduct* (ἀγωγή, 2 Tim. iii. 10) ; *confute* (διακατελέγχεσθαι, Acts xviii. 28) ; *deemeanour* (κατάστημα, Tit. ii. 3) ; *discipline* (σωφρονισμός, 2 Tim. i. 7) ; *disrepute* (ἀπelegμός, Acts xix. 27) ; *effulgence* (ἀπαύγασμα, Heb. i. 3) ; *goal* (σκοπός, Phil. iii. 14) ; *impostor* (γοής, 2 Tim. iii. 13) ; *to interpose* (μεσιτεύειν, Heb. vi. 17) ; *Justice* (ἡ Δίκη, Acts xxviii. 4) ; *to moor* (προσορμίζεσθαι, Mark vi. 53) ; *sacred* (ιέρως, 1 Cor. ix. 13, 2 Tim. iii. 15) ; *to shudder* (φρίσσειν, Jas. ii. 19) ; *stupor* (κατάνυξις, Rom. xi. 8) ; *to train* (σωφρονίζειν, Tit. ii. 4) ; *tranquil* (ἤρεμος, 1 Tim. ii. 2) ; *undressed* (ἀγναφος, Matt. ix. 16, Mark ii. 21) ; *without self-control* (ἀκρατής, 2 Tim. iii. 3).

11. A variation in the use of prepositions often suggests instructive lines of thought. A good illustration of such significant differences of expression lost in A.V. is supplied by a passage to which we have already referred for examples of differences introduced into A.V. which have no place in the original (1 Cor. xii. 4 ff). Here in the description of the manifestation of the Spirit we read in A.V., *To one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom ; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit ; to another faith by the same Spirit.* Thus "the word of wisdom," "the word of knowledge," and "faith" are presented in exactly the same connexion with the Spirit, as simply given "by" Him. But in the original three different prepositions are used to describe the relation of these three gifts to the Spirit, represented exactly in the R.V. by "*through* the Spirit," "*according to* the Spirit," "*in* the Spirit" (Vulgate, *per, secundum, in*). The English reader is necessarily led to consider whether this unexpected variation does not throw

N.T. only in the places quoted ; and the new English words cannot fairly be said to be inharmonious with the old. In making the list I have found great help from Messrs. Bemrose & Sons' excellent *Student's Concordance to the New Testament* (R.V.). London [1884].

some light upon the gifts themselves. Even if he finds no answer to the question at once, it will be something to have proposed it. He will at least be led to reflect on the difference between "wisdom" and "knowledge." He will feel perhaps that "wisdom" is absolute, unchangeable, belonging to things eternal; that "knowledge" is progressive, "growing from more to more." If this be so, he will understand that, in the one case, the Spirit is, as it were, the speaker of the word in the soul; that, in the other case, He is the guide who directs and rules and regulates the observation which finds expression through man. And when he has realised this twofold action of the Spirit, he will be prepared to consider that there is yet a third relation in which we may stand to Him. We may be, as it were, lost in Him, enwrapped in His transfiguring influence. Then the faith which wields the powers of the world to come has its scope. Now even if this particular interpretation be faulty or imperfect, still it will not have been without use that the English reader has been constrained, as the Greek reader, to take account of the manifold action no less than of the manifold gifts of the Spirit.

12. It is easy to multiply instances of other shades of thought conveyed by variation in construction which are neglected by A.V. For example, the key to the understanding of the tragic record in John viii., the crisis in the development of Jewish unbelief, lies in the change of phrase in *vv.* 30, 31. As the Lord spoke *many believed on Him* (*ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν*), with the devotion of perfect self-surrender; but there were others, "Jews" in the technical language of the evangelist, who *believed Him* (*πεπιστευκότας αὐτῷ*), who acknowledged the truth of His statements, and the justice of His claim to Messiahship, but would have made Him the Messiah of their own hearts, and by the force of that prepossession were prepared for fatal unbelief.¹

¹ Compare John iv. 21, 39; xiv. 11, 12; v. 24, 38, 46 f.

The difference in the view of the destiny of Christian ministrations marked in R.V. of Eph. iv. 12 is less striking at first sight, but it will repay consideration. The Divine gifts, as we now read, are made *for* (πρός) *the perfecting of the saints, unto* (εἰς) *the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ.* Our conception of the Divine word is made clearer when we distinguish the first Author of the message from the prophet who delivers it. The word is spoken *by* (ὑπό) God, and *through* (διά) His messenger (Matt. i. 22, xxi. 4, xxii. 31).¹ So again there is a difference in the conception of spiritual activities where they are referred to an origin regarded as apart (ἀπό), or to a source from which they flow as in continuous connexion with it (ἐξ), or as belonging to the agent (gen.). It is indeed most difficult to do more than suggest to the English student a subject for reflection, but this is the effect of the Greek upon the reader of the original (comp. 2 Cor. iii. 5, iv. 7).²

13. It may be objected that there is something of over-refinement in the distinctions which have been just noticed. No such charge lies against the distinction of separate and yet related words in the same context. The book of the Revelation furnishes good illustrations of the loss or confusion which has arisen from the neglect of this obvious duty of a translator. One main thought of the book is the conflict between the brute forces of earthly empire and the spiritual force of the risen Saviour. According to the imagery of the Old Testament there is on the one side "one like to a Son of man" (i. 13, xiv. 14); and on the other "a seven-headed beast (xi. 7 ff), which becomes the organ of the false spirit. So far the picture is clear; but

¹ Compare John i. 3, 10, 17; Acts ii. 43, xii. 9; 1 Cor. viii. 6.

² Not unfrequently it is impossible to convey the impression of the original, even where the thought involved is of importance (John xvi. 27, 28, 30, παρά, ἐξ, ἀπό; i. 1, πρὸς).

it is strangely disturbed when the same name "beast" is applied to the four "living creatures" before the throne which render to God the unceasing homage of creation (iv. 6 ff, v. 6, vi. 1 ff, xiv. 3, xv. 7, xix. 4). The reader misses the pregnant contrast between the world as God made it and as it is still so far as it remains in fellowship with Him, and the world as it is in isolated self-assertion opposed to Him.

We have already noticed how seriously the two renderings of "throne" mar the representation of the conflict of good and evil in the Apocalypse (III. § 12). The rendering of two words by the one word "crown" has not been less injurious in another aspect. The common word for crown (*στέφανος*)—the significant name of the first martyr—suggested to the Greek reader simply the victor's wreath. This is the thought of "the crown of life" (Rev. ii. 10; comp. iii. 11), "the incorruptible crown" (1 Cor. ix. 25), "the crown of righteousness" (2 Tim. iv. 8), "the crown of glory that fadeth not away" (1 Pet. v. 4), "the crown of gold" of the elders (Rev. iv. 4, 10), the crown of the great Conqueror (vi. 2), and the very crown of thorns, the victor's wreath of "the Man of sorrows." But in contrast with this there is the "diadem"—the fillet of the Persian king—the symbol of sovereign dignity. The word is found in the N.T. only in the Apocalypse. It occurs three times, and in each case its force is unmistakable. The great dragon had "upon his head seven diadems" (Rev. xii. 3). The ten-horned beast had "on his horns ten diadems" (Rev. xiii. 1). And then, in significant contrast with this unholy and usurped dominion, when the Word of God is revealed in His Majesty, bearing His Name as "King of kings and Lord of lords," He has "upon His head many diadems" (Rev. xix. 12), bearing sway not in one order only but in many.

14. In these cases the distinction of the synonymes

belongs to the right understanding of the imagery of the whole book. Elsewhere it affects the full meaning of the particular passage, and the importance of distinguishing the related words becomes even more apparent when they are found in the same context. Probably the most striking illustration of the harm which may follow from the neglect of this consideration is furnished by John x. 16, where the whole character of the Lord's promise has been obscured by the unhappy rendering of two perfectly distinct Greek words by "fold." The R.V. has now restored the rendering of Tyndale and Coverdale, and we read: *Other sheep I have which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear My voice; and they shall become one flock* (A.V. fold), *one shepherd* (Ezek. xxxiv. 23).

The false rendering came from the Latin Vulgate, and the phrase "one fold, one shepherd" had probably been made familiar in English by Wiclif. But the old Latin, like the other ancient versions, marked the difference, which is clear in the original; and it would be difficult to over-rate the evil influence which the confusion of the "fold" and the "flock" has exercised on popular theology. Elsewhere the great lesson of the corporate union of the Church is taught, but here the thought is of the spring of unity in personal relationship with Christ.

15. The example which has been given is of exceptional interest. The force of the correction is felt at once. In other cases the gain of exactness is less conspicuous, and yet of real moment. This will be seen from a few representative passages, which shew the general character of the changes made in order to distinguish synonymes in close connexion.

Matt. xxvi. 55, xxvii. 15: *Jesus said, I sat daily in the temple teaching, and ye took me not. . . . Judas cast down the pieces of silver into the sanctuary* (A.V. temple), *and departed*. The distinction between the temple with its

courts (*ἱερόν*) and the sanctuary, the dwelling-place of God (*ναός*), is essential to the understanding of the outward ritual of Judaism, and of its spiritual counterpart. The temple (*ἱερόν*) has no place in the Apocalypse. The sanctuary (*ναός*) is the image of the body of Christ and of Christians (John ii. 19, 21; 1 Cor. iii. 16 f, vi. 19; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Eph. ii. 21), and in all these places the attention of the reader is called to the exact word by a marginal note.

Luke ix. 24: *Whosoever* would (A.V. will) *save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall* (A.V. will) *lose his life for My sake, the same shall save it.* The difference between the desire of saving (*ὅς ἂν θέλῃ σῶσαι*) and the fact of losing (*ὅς ἂν ἀπολέσῃ*) is entirely lost in A.V., though it is obviously required for the meaning of the passage.

John i. 11: *He came unto His own* (*τὰ ἴδια*), *and they that were His own* (*οἱ ἴδιοι*; A.V. *and His own*) *received Him not.* The separate mention of the "holy land" and "holy people" applies to the word that which is said of Jehovah in the Old Testament with singular fulness.

John vi. 10: *Jesus said, Make the people* (*τοὺς ἀνθρώπους* A.V. *the men*) *sit down.* . . . *So the men* (*οἱ ἄνδρες*) *sat down, in number about five thousand.* The change of word calls up at once the additional clause in St. Matthew (xiv. 21).

Acts iv. 27, 28: *Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the peoples* (*λαοῖς*) *of Israel, were gathered together, to do whatsoever Thy hand and Thy counsel fore-ordained to come to pass* (*γενέσθαι*; A.V. *to be done*). The variation of expression illustrates what has been already said in § 2.

1 Cor. xiv. 20: *Brethren, be not children* (*παιδία*) *in mind: howbeit in malice be ye babes* (*νηπιιάζετε*; A.V. *be ye children*), *but in mind be men.* The literal translation of the verb (*νηπιιάζειν*), which occurs here only in the New Testament

brings out the climax of the thought (comp. 1 Cor. iii. 1 ; Heb. v. 13).

Heb. iv. 9 f: *There remaineth therefore a sabbath rest (σαββατισμός; A.V. rest) for the people of God. For he that is entered into his rest (κατάπαυσις) hath himself also rested from his works, as God did from His.* The peculiar word significantly connects the character of the promised rest of man with that of the rest of God.

1 Pet. v. 7: *Casting all your anxiety (μέριμνα; A.V. care) upon Him, because He careth (μέλει) for you.*¹

16. Sometimes the exact rendering of connected words removes that which is embarrassing in the text of A.V. Thoughtful readers of the English Testament must often have been perplexed by the apparent discrepancy between the two sayings as to the Baptist in John i. 8, v. 35, which now are brought into a most significant harmony. *He was not the light: He was the lamp that burneth and shineth, kindled from another source, and ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light.*² There is again, to take a different kind of illustration, an unmeaning harshness in the words, *he that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet*, which is at once removed when we know that there

¹ Other instructive examples will be found in Matt. iv. 19 ff. (*come ye after Me, followed*); v. 17 f. (*fulfil, accomplished*); Mark v. 40 ff. (*child, damsel*); Luke xii. 3 (*said, spoken*); xiv. 12 f. (*call, bid*); xvii. 26 (*come to pass, be*); John viii. 49, 54 (*honour, glorify*); xvi. 16 (*behold, see*); xvii. 12 (*kept, guarded*); xx. 5 f. (*seeth, beholdeth*); xxi. 15 f. (*feed, find*); Acts i. 2, 9 (*received up, taken up*); iii. 2, 10 (*door, gate*); vii. 13 (*made known, became manifest*); viii. 20 (*silver, money*); Rom. xiii. 2 (*resisteth, withstandeth*); 1 Cor. x. 16 f. (*partake of, have communion with*); xi. 30 (*many, not a few*); xi. 31 (*discerned, judged*); xiv. 7 (*voice, sound*); xiv. 36 (*went, came*); 2 Cor. iv. 4, 6 (*dawn, shine*); Gal. i. 6 f. (*a different, another*); iii. 15, 17 (*maketh void, disannul*); Phil. iv. 17 f. (*increaseth, abound*); Col. iii. 23 (*do, work*); 1 Thess. ii. 13 (*received, accepted*); 1 Tim. iii. 1 (*seeketh, desireth*); 2 Tim. iv. 16 f. (*took my part, stood by me*); Heb. i. 14 (*minister, do service*); xii. 26 (*shake, make to tremble*); Jas. i. 17 (*gift, boon*). Even when the English rendering is inadequate the reader is led to seek for completer help.

² Comp. Matt. vi. 22, *The lamp of the body is the eye* (Luke xi. 33 ff); 2 Pet. i. 19, *The word of prophecy . . . a lamp shining in a dark place*; Rev. xxi. 23, *The glory of God did lighten it, and the lamp thereof was the Lamb.*

is a contrast in the original between the washing of the whole body and the washing of some small part: *he that is bathed* (ὁ λελουμένος) *needeth not save to wash* (νίψασθαι) *his feet* (John xiii. 10), just as the guest who rests in the evening after his day's journey (1 Tim. v. 10).¹ Stress is often laid upon a supposed change in St. Paul's opinions as to the coming of the Lord. A reader of A.V. would naturally suppose that he had a conclusive proof of the fact, whatever use he might make of it, in a comparison of 2 Thess. ii. 2, *be not . . . troubled . . . by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand*, with Rom. xiii. 12, *The night is far spent, the day is at hand*. The R.V. now marks the peculiar word in the former passage (ἐνέστηκεν, not ἤγγικεν), *as that the day of the Lord is now present*, and points to the false opinion involved (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 18). The rendering in Luke xxiv. 25, *O foolish men* (ἀνόητοι) *and slow of heart to believe . . . is no doubt less vigorous than O fools, and slow of heart to believe . . .*; but the English reader will be glad to know that the Lord does not apply to the disciples the condemnation of Scribes and Pharisees (Matt. xxiii. 17, *μωροί*).

17. It happens not unfrequently that no simple rendering can represent the distinctions between synonymes conveyed by the original. In such cases, where there seemed to be a likelihood of misunderstanding, a marginal note directs the attention of the reader to the shade of meaning of which he must take account. For example, our English word "world" has to do duty for three Greek words most distinct in meaning. Most commonly "world" stands for a word (κόσμος) which has been naturalised in modern English as *cosmos*. This presents the thought of the whole sum of finite being as apart from God, and specially it

¹ For "bathed" compare Eph. v. 26; Tit. iii. 5. It is to be regretted, I think, that "bathed" was not substituted for "washed" in Heb. x. 22 (Exod. xxix. 4; Lev. xvi. 4).

describes all that falls under our observation which is actually estranged from God. Again, "world" answers to a plural or singular, "the ages," or "the age" (οἱ αἰῶνες, ὁ αἰὼν), in which creation is regarded as a vast system unfolded from æon to æon, as an immeasurable and orderly development of being under the condition of time, of which each "age," or "this age" and "the age to come," has its distinguishing characteristics, and so far is "the world." And, thirdly the "world" renders a term (ἡ οἰκουμένη) which describes the seat of settled government and civilised life, practically conterminous with the Roman Empire. The occurrence of the two latter forms in the original is marked by the margins "ages" or "age" and "the inhabited earth." (See Heb. i. 2, vi. 5 text, ix. 26, xi. 3; Matt. xii. 32, xiii. 22, 39, etc.; Heb. i. 6, ii. 5; Matt. xxix. 14; Luke ii. 1.) In like manner "devil" has been retained as the translation of three words (διάβολος, δαίμων, δαιμόνιον); but a margin (Gk. *demon*) is added when either of the two latter words is so rendered. Elsewhere a marginal note calls attention to the occurrence of an unusual word (καταφιλεῖν, Matt. xxvi. 48, Luke vii. 45), or to a difference of moment, either for the interpretation of the passage (δούλος, διάκονος, Matt. xxii. 1 ff, Mark x. 43 f; φιλεῖν, ἀγαπᾶν, John xxi. 16; κλαίειν, δακρύνειν, John xi. 31, 33, 35), or for the identification of the incident (κόφινος, σφυρίς, Matt. xvi. 9, Mark viii. 19).

18. We may conclude with an example of a different kind which is found in Gal. vi. 2, 5, where we read in close sequence, *Bear ye one another's burdens*, and . . . *every man shall bear his own burden*. But we are now informed that "burden" represents two Greek words (βάρος, φόρτος), and that in the second case many think the rendering "load" preferable. In any case the English reader is guided to a true discernment of that which sympathy can and cannot do. It is indeed most true that

we must all support that which God assigns to us, but friendship can lighten the weight of that which we are required to bear.

B. F. WESTCOTT.

HOMILETICAL FEATURES OF THE EPISTLE TO
THE ROMANS.

IT is not from the brief notes of his sermons in the Acts that we get our best idea of the preaching powers of St. Paul. Some of his epistles are emphatically sermons, the words of a living man to living men, obviously written with a most vivid sense of his audience, aglow with the inspiration which a sympathetic audience brings, and dealing with men at close quarters, as only impassioned preachers can. The Epistle to the Romans is by far the best example of these qualities. It does not exhibit such a death struggle as the Epistle to the Galatians; it is not so much preaching *à outrance*, as was said of the sermons of Bossuet; but it presents a more thorough combination of the various properties that make up a highly effective discourse. It is in most respects what the Apostle would have preached at Rome if he had had an hour to spend with the Christians there. It is of course much more closely packed than would have been suitable in any ordinary sermon. But in this respect it is only the counterpart of the Sermon on the Mount. Its concentration does not hinder it, any more than it hinders the Sermon on the Mount, from reflecting the great homiletical features of its author's mind. It is directed to the two great objects of homiletical discourse—instruction and persuasion; and these two objects are prosecuted in the proportions suitable to a sermon. First addressing himself to the intellect of his audience, the