

*THE REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW
TESTAMENT.*

A PLEA FOR HESITATION AS TO ITS ADOPTION.

THE Centenary of the British and Foreign Bible Society has not unnaturally once more brought into increased prominence the proposals urged from time to time for the more extended use of the Revised Version, whether in public or in private, in preference to the Authorized Version. May I venture to put in, even thus late, a new and earnest plea for hesitation? To call in serious question the value of the work of so large and distinguished a body of scholars as the Revisers, must always have the appearance of presumption; but the matter appears to me so grave that, at all risks, "freedom of speech" is, in my opinion, not only justifiable, but, in the interests of truth and edification, a still imperative duty. The Revisers themselves were, as was admitted on all sides, not all of equal competence, either as textual critics or as Greek scholars, and their decisions were the decisions of majorities. While, then, it may rightly be maintained, as has often been urged, that the R.V. advantageously removes various obsolete expressions and other minor defects of the A.V., and throws light on sundry obscure passages, it must still be firmly asserted that it is burdened with more serious inaccuracies than it removes, and that, upon the whole, it falls far short of the merits of the old Version. I will not refer (or only very slightly) to the question of the *Greek Text*, framed by the Revisers for their basis, unduly influenced as it was by an over-estimate, at that time, of certain ancient authorities. I will simply crave indulgence while I call attention, by a few specimens, to their *erroneous renderings*, and indicate the seriousness of their character. Some or all of these have, doubtless, already been noticed and dealt with to

some extent by others; but I have of express purpose written independently of all others in the hope that fresh force may be added to the argument. I must, however, apologize to both scholars and general readers for the introduction of various grammatical and lexicographical elements, without which, out of regard to the authority of the Revisers, no conclusions of sufficient cogency could have been reached.

(a) Rom. iii. 9: "*Are we in worse case than they?* No, by no means: for, etc." προεχόμεθα (A.V. "*Are we better than they?*"). I take this example first, as being one of the most startling, and (as I believe) one of the very worst of the Revisers' alterations. It shall be considered, as is necessary, from the points of view of both scholarship and context. Both here and in the subsequent passages to be noticed, internal criticism must be allowed much greater weight than the Revisers have given to it. Now, apart from context, the Greek word προεχόμεθα is in form either the *middle* or (as the Revisers take it) the *passive* voice of an active προέχειν, which has the various meanings of *holding in front of* another, *being in front of*, *excelling*. Of the *middle* voice there are extant examples on the sense of *holding in front of oneself* as a shield, pretext, etc.; as in Hdn. 172, προέχασθαι γήρας, "*putting forward as an excuse his old age.*" From this usage comes the marginal rendering in our verse, "*do we excuse ourselves?*" which seems to require, however, an object, as in the passage just cited. In the sense of *excel*, there is apparently no extant example in the *middle* voice. Of the *passive* voice there are extant undoubted examples in the sense of *to be excelled*: e.g. Plut. ii. 1038, "*good men are not excelled even by Zeus himself.*" A choice, then, has to be made between the *middle* and the *passive*. Now if, as by the Revisers, the word be taken as *passive*, then the rendering suggested by examples will be, not "*in worse case,*" but

worse, morally worse, excelled by them morally. But the context repudiates such a signification. The rendering of the Revisers (if I may be pardoned for saying so) reduces the reasoning to an absurdity. S. Paul has been exhibiting the universal depravity of both Gentile (i. 18-32) and Jew (ii. 17-29); and what is absolutely certain is that whatever be the implied assertion in *προεχόμεθα*, he gives to it in his *οὐ πάντως*, "No, by no means," a most emphatic negative, and assigns his reason. Now with the Revisers' rendering, the argument will run thus: "The Gentiles are gross sinners: are we Jews, who have had the advantage of the Divine Oracles, in worse case than they? No, by no means: for our charge of sin has been laid against Jew as well as Gentile, and that in accordance with the Law, which speaks to us Jews, and declares us to be utterly sinful; "none of us righteous, no, not one." How is this answer a negative to the inquiry "Are we in worse case"? To suit the Revisers' rendering, the answer required would be: "No, by no means worse; for the Law justifies us." The *passive* sense, then, as interpreted by the Revisers, is ruled out by the context. On the other hand, if we accept the word as a *middle* voice, then, whether we take the marginal, "do we excuse ourselves?" or the A.V. "are we better than they?" there is at least no violence to the context. S. Paul's emphatic negative is suited to either. There remains, however, the question of grammar; that is: Can the *middle* voice be used like the *active* in the sense of *excel*? That it can be used for *excusing oneself* has already been seen. Now though there probably is no other extant example of the sense of *excel* in the *middle* voice in the surviving literature (extant confirmatory examples are wanting to many words), still there is ample justification for it in the genius of the language; that is to say, as the *passive* can signify *to be excelled*, so, in accordance with the laws of the language, the *middle*, like the *active*, can signify

to *excel*. Illustrations are found, e.g., in the use of the middle voice of other compounds of ἔχειν, as in ἀπέχεσθαι, ἀνέχεσθαι, ἀντέχεσθαι; also in the use of the active and middle voices of various verbs, such as ἐνεργεῖν and ἐνεργίεσθαι, both *to work*; πληροῦν and πληροῦσθαι, both *to fill*; σφραγίζειν and σφραγίζεσθαι, both *to seal* (all in N.T.). I pass by, for the present, the case of Colossians ii. 15. So, then, both προέχειν and προέχεσθαι, so far as the laws of the language are concerned, can both signify *to excel*, the *middle* no less (probably even more fully) than the *active*. The result is that scholarship sanctions the sense which the context demands. *Do we excel? Have we any moral pre-eminency?* Or, simply and preferably, as A.V., "*Are we better than they?*" And this is retained by the American Revisers. So the Vulgate *præcellimus*; so also plainly the old variant Greek reading προκατέχομεν, "*are we superior?*" and the Old Latin *tenemus amplius?*

(b) Rom. v. 1, "*let us have peace with God*"; reading ἔχωμεν (A.V. "*we have peace*"; reading ἔχομεν). The context is decisive against this change, which vitiates S. Paul's argument, and introduces a serious error of doctrine. S. Paul is treating of the *effects* of justification through the propitiation made by Christ, and enforces that one of these effects is *perfect reconciliation with God* (vv. 9, 10; cf. iii. 24, 25). But *perfect reconciliation* implies *peace*: the enmity no longer exists. It is not a matter for exhortation, but of declaration; and so "*we have peace.*" So Colossians i. 20, "*reconcile all things, having made peace through the blood,*" etc. And so expressly, as the very essence of the Gospel, Acts x. 36: "*preaching the glad tidings of peace through Jesus Christ.*" Further, this is apparent from the addition of the word "*also*" in v. 2: "*We have peace through our Lord, through whom also we have had access.*" Change *we have* into *let us have*, and the *also* is unmeaning. (For similar uses of "*also*" by S. Paul,

cf. viii. 17; xi. 16; 2 Cor. iii. 6; Eph. i. 11; Phil. iii. 20; Col. ii. 10-12). Why then did the Revisers make such a change? Because, ignoring internal evidence, they deemed ἔχωμεν with ω a better attested textual reading than ἔχομεν with ο. But the interchange of these two vowels in MSS. is so common that against clear internal evidence it is not worth serious consideration. It occurs, e.g., in our previous passage, iii. 9, in the very word there discussed (προεχώμεθα for προεχόμεθα), and also in 1 Cor. xv. 49 with far better attestation than here (φορέσωμεν, *let us wear*, instead of φορέσομεν, *we shall wear*); but the Revisers have in both cases wisely shrunk from the change. We must decidedly retain the A.V. "*we have peace*"; the American Revisers likewise retain it.

(c) 1 Cor. vi. 7, "Nay, already it is altogether a defect in you that ye have lawsuits one with another." ἥττημα and ὑμῶν (A.V. *a fault among you*; reading ἐν ὑμῶν). What? Merely a "*defect in you*" after the "Nay, already" — ἤδη standing the first word—and after the indignant inquiry of v. 1, "*Dare any of you go to law before the unrighteous?*" No; S. Paul, who loves to illustrate and enforce his appeals by use of the technical terms of soldier life, of the public games, commerce, etc., here makes use of one (as of other) of the technical terms of the law-courts, ἥττημα, a *loss of suit, loss of cause, defeat* (cf. the corresponding verb ἥττησθαι, *to lose one's cause, be defeated*, in the Greek Oratt.); and he uses it with a scornful oxymoron, to which his "*nay, already*" gives force: "*Go to law? Why, already, at the very outset, it is a loss of your cause, a defeat to you [not in you] that ye have any lawsuits at all one with another.*" Unquestionably this is the meaning. If the marginal "*loss to you*" be intended for *loss of cause*, then it has caught the right meaning; but the word "*loss*" by itself is too general, and misses the sarcasm. *Loss of cause* might stand; but for a single word, "*defeat*" is the

technical term, and should be adopted : " Nay, already it is a *defeat* to you," etc. This is also the more clear from the correct reading *ὑμῖν*, not *ἐν ὑμῖν*.

(d) 1 Cor. xv. 27, " But *when he saith*, all things are put in subjection, it is evident that he is excepted," etc., *ὅταν εἴπῃ* . . . *δῆλον ὅτι ἔκτος τοῦ, κ.τ.λ.* (A.V. *when he saith all*, etc.). It is incomprehensible to me how the Revisers have gone wrong here. To begin with, their rendering of *ὅταν εἴπῃ* is ungrammatical ; and the words " *All things are*," etc., are not, as they imply, a repetition of the citation from Psalm viii. 6, " *He hath put all things in subjection.*" This is already shown by the use of the *perfect ὑποτέτακται*, instead of an aorist, *ὑπέταξεν*, as in the Psalm. The Apostle is not turning aside to guard the citation from misconstruction of its scope, but is directing his glowing thought to the glorious moment of its perfect fulfilment, when the cry shall go forth of the completion of the subjugation of the Son's enemies. The *ὅταν εἴπῃ* marks that moment ; viz. *when he shall say*, not *when he saith* (for this *ὅταν* cf. *vv.* 24, 54 ; *xiii.* 10 ; *Col.* iii. 4) ; and the words " *it is evident that he is excepted*," which should rather be rendered, " *evidently excepting him*" (there is no verb, only the adverbial *δηλόνοσι* and the prep. *ἔκτος*), merely introduce a *parenthesis*, the main statement being resumed by the *ὅταν δὲ*, but *when* (not " *and when*") of *v.* 28. (For a similar parenthesis with *δηλόνοσι* and similar resumption see *Xen. Cyr.* ii. 3.) Carefully noting, then, the force of the pf. *ὑποτέτακται* (cf. the pf. *τετέλεσται*, *it is finished*, *John* xix. 30), we arrive at the true and grand meaning : " But *when He shall say*, All things are now become subject—evidently excepting him who, etc.—but *when, I say*, all things shall have become subject, *then* shall the Son also become subject, that God may be all in all."

(e) 2 Cor. ii. 13, 14, " I had no relief . . . But thanks be to God, who always *leadeth us in triumph* in Christ."

θριαμβεύει (A.V. *causeth us to triumph*). It shall at once be admitted that, except it be in this passage, there is no extant example of the *causative* force of the Greek word here employed. In the only other passage in which it occurs in the New Testament, viz. in Colossians ii. 15, it is rendered *triumph over* (a rendering, curiously enough, possibly for ambiguity's sake, avoided here by the Revisers), and there, and in all the instances found in secular literature, it is the term used for a conqueror's celebration of triumph over vanquished foes: "*He leads them in triumph, triumphs over them.*" How emphatic and appropriate this meaning is in Colossians ii. 15 for the triumph of Christ or the Father over the vanquished "powers" of darkness is obvious. But how utterly inappropriate and impossible here! Christ is the Vanquisher, not the vanquished; and "*in Christ*" Christians are not vanquished and "*led in triumph,*" but "*more than conquerors*" (Rom. viii. 37).

They share their Leader's victory,
And triumph with their King.

Nor, to deal with the possibly intended ambiguity of the Revisers' phrase, may it be replied that the meaning can be that Christians are "*led in triumph in Christ*" as *co-victors*. The term never had and cannot bear such meaning; victors are not *led*, but *lead* (cf. Gell. ii. 11. 4, "*triumphavit cum imperatoribus suis*"). No; human relief had failed the Apostle, but as in his previous epistle, xv. 57, he had exclaimed, "*But thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory,*" so here he exclaims, "*But thanks be to God, who causeth us to triumph.*" It remains, of course, to examine whether this *causative* force of the Greek word is ruled out by the absence of other extant examples of its use (cf. above, under Rom. iii. 9). It certainly is not so ruled out. There is abundant evidence, especially in our late Greek, of the *causative* use of the verbs ending, as our present

word does, in *-ευν*, and sometimes with only one extant example. In the New Testament itself, e.g., we have *μαθητεύειν*, which signifies *to be a disciple*, used in the sense of *cause to be a disciple* (Matt. xxviii. 19; Acts xiv. 41); *περισσέυειν*, *to abound*, used for *cause to abound* (2 Cor. iv. 15; ix. 87); and in Septuagint of Old Testament *βασιλεύειν*, *to be a king*, used in the sense of *cause to be a king* (1 Chron. xxix. 22). Other instances are *εἰρηνεύειν*, *to be at peace*, and *cause to be at peace*; *ἐνεδρεύειν*, *to lie in ambush*, and *cause to lie in ambush*; *πρεσβεύειν*, *to have precedence*, and *cause to have precedence*. The usage is perfectly clear. Thus, on grammatical grounds, no sound reason exists for refusing to our *θριαμβεύειν* the possible sense of *causing to triumph* as well as *to triumph*; and, as this is the sense demanded by the context, the Revisers' rendering must be rejected, and the A.V. retained, "*Thanks be to God, who causeth us to triumph in Christ.*"

(f) 2 Cor. iii. 18, "But we all, with unveiled face *reflecting-as-a-mirror* the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory." *Κατοπτριζόμενοι* (A.V. *beholding-as-in-a-glass*, sc. *as in a mirror*). The minor changes made by the Revisers in this verse (*unveiled, transformed*) are sound and serviceable, but the main alteration, *reflecting* for *beholding*, is wholly unwarrantable and highly detrimental. However plausible it may appear at first sight, it will not bear close examination, but is condemned alike by scholarship and by context. S. Paul does indeed for a moment, in passing, draw a contrast between the act of Moses in "*veiling his face*" and the "*boldness of speech*" of himself and his fellow-apostles (vv. 12, 13); but the main contrast of the whole of his exposition in this and the following chapter is totally different, viz. between the *abiding veil* on the Jewish people and the *removal of the veil* in Christ. Our verse, then, to be rightly understood, must be studied in the light

of the entire context (iii. 1-iv. 6), and of the historical reference in Exodus xxxiv. 29-35, especially as this appears in the Septuagint version, from which several special words are exactly reproduced in this chapter. But, before considering the context, it is essential to examine into the meaning of the word *κατοπτριζόμενοι* itself, and ascertain whether the Revisers have any justification for their change by reason of the Greek usage of the word. Absolutely none. Independently of this verse and of comments thereon, there does not exist (I believe I am right in so saying) a single example in all Greek literature of the use of *any one of the three* voices of the verb, *active, passive, or middle*, supporting the sense of *to reflect*. It has absolutely nothing to rest upon. The Greek word for *to reflect* is a totally different word, *ἐμφαίνειν, ἐμφαίνεσθαι*, with its noun *ἐμφασις* for the *reflexion*; e.g., Plat. *Rep.* 402, "images, whether they be *reflected* (*ἐμφαίνονται*) in still waters or in mirrors." On the other hand, the word *κατοπτρίζεσθαι* is the everyday Greek word for *using a mirror, looking at oneself in a looking-glass, contemplating one's own image* or the image of anything else reflected in a mirror of any kind; the *mirror* and the *image, speculi imago*, being correlative terms. Thus Artemidorus has an entire section entitled, *περὶ τοῦ κατοπτρίζεσθαι*, "*Concerning looking at oneself in a mirror.*" It begins with the words, "*To look into a mirror (κατοπτρίζεσθαι) and see one's own image like to oneself,*" etc. (ii. 7). He uses the compound *ἐγκατοπτρίζεσθαι* in the same sense. The delight of Aphrodite is *κατοπτρίζεσθαι*, "*to survey herself in the mirror*" (Athen. v. 687). We are reminded of Mr. Loudan's picture in the Royal Academy of this year:—

Mirror, mirror on the wall,
Am I most beautiful of all?

For ethical reasons, Socrates recommended all young men

frequently *κατοπτρίζεσθαι*, “to look at themselves in the glass.” Plato gave the same advice to drunkards (Diog. L. ii. 33; iii. 39; cited by Schleusner). These are all examples of the ordinary and literal sense. The *metaphorical* sense is well seen in the noble passage of S. Paul’s contemporary, Phil. J. i. 106, 7 (possibly known to S. Paul, and having several notable words common to his epistles and to the Epistle to the Hebrews): “God is the archetype of the image, and the image becomes the archetype of others, etc. He who is initiated in the mysteries judges not that which is abiding from the shadow, but receives a clear reflexion (*ἐμφασιν*) of the uncreated. Such is Moses, who says, “Manifest thyself to me” [Exod. xxxiii. 13]: sc. Do not manifest thyself to me by anything created, etc., neither let me *behold* (*κατοπτριζόμενω*) thy form as in a mirror in aught but in thyself, O God: for reflexions (*ἐμφάσεις*) in created things melt away.” Thus, then, both the literal and the metaphorical meaning, *behold as in a mirror*, are beyond dispute, and *usage produces no other*. Does the context, then, which is the next branch of the inquiry, demand or even suggest the abandonment of so indisputable a signification in favour of another which is purely fictitious? The very reverse is the case. It may safely be premised, without any *petitio principii*, that the contrast enforced in caps. iii. and iv. is a contrast between *spiritual blindness* and *spiritual enlightenment*; also that the first words of our verse, “*but we all,*” indicate that not the Apostles alone, but the whole body of Christian believers, are the subject of the verse. S. Paul, having repudiated the charge of self-commendation (*v. 1*), could not apply the language of this verse to some specially glorious transformation of himself and his fellows alone. But neither in the case of S. Paul and his fellows, nor in the case of the whole body of believers, can the contrast intended be between the “unveiled face” on the one side

and the "veiled face" of Moses on the other. For the face of Moses also was as entirely "unveiled," so it is expressly stated, when he delivered the oracles of God as when he received them: only "*when he had done speaking*" did he put the veil on: with "*face unveiled*" he went in to see and commune with the Lord (Exod. *l.c.*). So too in our verse the phrase "*unveiled face*," ἀνακαλυμμένω, pf. pass. tense, signifies not merely a face *without a veil*, but a face, so far like that of Moses, *from which a veil previously worn has been removed*. Such removal of the veil suggests in the one case what is emphasized in the other, that the purpose of the act is for *seeing* and not for *reflecting*. The intended contrast, then, not being with Moses, must be with the Jewish people at large who believe not in Christ, whose hearts are darkened and their perceptions blunted that they cannot bear or see the surpassing glory of the gospel, even as their fathers could not look steadfastly on the minor glory of the Law. Now what can the contrast be to this condition? To *fail to see* and to *reflect* are not a contrast in terms, but to *fail to see* and to *see* are the contrast; to "*behold with unveiled face*," not to *reflect*. But, in addition to missing the evident requirement of the contrasted terms, the rendering *reflect* introduces a most unnatural confusion of metaphors, viz. that the *mirrors*, instead of merely *reflecting the image*, are themselves transformed into and *become the image*, "*transformed into the same image*." Thus the context, no less than scholarship, rejects the R.V. rendering, and compels adherence to the A.V. *behold*. The fine sense of the original may be seen by a paraphrase: "The Jewish people, veiled and blinded, see not the glory of the gospel; but all are believers in Christ, from whose faces the old veil of ignorance and unbelief has been perfectly removed, though the direct beatific vision is not yet, yet beholding and contemplating as in a mirror the reflected glory of the Lord, even Him who is

the Image of the Invisible (Col. i. 15) and the Brightness of His glory (Heb. i. 3) are gradually transformed (*μεταμορφούμεθα, pres.*) into the same image, from one degree of glory to another, under the operation of the Spirit." And so, without paraphrase, "But we all, *beholding as in a mirror* the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image," etc. No other rendering is possible. To cite once more from Philo, the following passage (ii. 426) is a remarkably happy illustration of S. Paul's thought, and even of his language. Philo says, "The continuous impressions produced by noble examples engrave on all but very hardened souls *images nearly resembling the originals*. Whence it comes that those who are willing to imitate noble and admirable qualities are bidden not to despair of the *change for the better*." In paraphrase: All but hardened souls, contemplating any noble examples, are changed into the image of those whom they would imitate. The change comes by *beholding*, not *reflecting*; and it is a change into the *image* of the exemplars. S. Paul and Philo are at one.

(g) Col. ii. 15, "*Having put off from himself the principalities and powers he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them.*" ἀπεκδυσάμενος (A.V., *having spoiled*, sc. *despoiled*). The Revisers mean *having stript off from himself* as one strips off a garment, etc., or as a serpent sloughs his skin (see below). It is at once a serious objection that the meaning of their rendering is (as in many other cases) unintelligible without reference to the Greek. The more serious and fatal objection is that their rendering lacks congruity and adequate introduction to the triumphant words that follow. Once more the Revisers have grievously impaired the sense by ignoring the capability of the Greek middle voice, of which ἀπεκδυσάμενος is an example, adopting a signification which undoubtedly, apart from

any demands of context, is perfectly legitimate by itself, viz., *stripping oneself*, and rejecting another equally admissible, which is demanded by the context, viz., *stripping another*. These points demand and shall have full examination. The word in question is the *middle* voice of an *active* form ἀπεκδύειν, which, in regard to the sense of *stripping another*, some might have expected to find used in this passage rather than the *middle*. This *active*, however, was very rarely, even if ever, employed (the instances sometimes cited from Babrius and Josephus are incorrect readings), but if employed would certainly signify to *put off* a garment either *from oneself* or *from another* (cf. the act. μετεκδύς, Jos. Ant. vi. 14, of Saul *putting off his own royal robe*; and the act. ἐκδιδύσκειν, 1 Sam. xxxi. 8, Gr., of soldiers *stripping the slain*). The *middle* ἀπεκδύεσθαι, our word, is likewise exceedingly rare, but undoubtedly can have for a meaning both lit. and metaph., to *put off from oneself* as a garment is put off. So it is used metaph. in the only other passage of its occurrence in the New Testament, viz., iii. 9 of this epistle (“*put off the old man*”); and similarly the related noun ἀπέκδυσις in v. 11 (“*the putting off of the body of the flesh*”). So also two other compounds of δύνειν in the *middle* voice, ἐνδύεσθαι, ἀποδύεσθαι, are respectively used, both lit. and metaph., of *putting on* and *putting off* or *divesting oneself* of clothing, virtues and vices, infirmities, and even teachers, in reference to embracing, submitting to or renouncing their teaching, etc. (See the phrases in New Testament, *putting off* the old man, *putting on* the new, *putting on* Christ, *putting on* immortality, compassion, etc., Rom. xiii. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 53-4; Gal. iii. 27; Col. iii. 9-12). All this is undeniable, and claims consideration. So I have purposely stated it fully. But now, apart altogether from the question of context, can it therefore be said, by any reasonable stretch of the metaphor, *pace* some patristic

comments, that Christ, by His assumption of human nature, had so “*put on the principalities and powers*” of darkness that He could similarly be said to “*put them off*”? For if He “*put them off*” or *divested Himself of them* in any sense, He must certainly first have *put them on*, or *invested Himself in them* in that sense, and exhibited them in his life and character. But it seems incredible that, to describe Christ’s subjection to the infirmities and sufferings of our nature, S. Paul should have resorted to so extraordinary a phrase as that He “*put on the principalities and powers.*” Clearer and simpler phrases were ready to his hand. But still more incredible would the phrase be if the subject of the verb be not *Christ*, but *God the Father*. And this supposition, even if not (as seems) the more probable, cannot be lightly put aside. *God the Father* is certainly and obviously the subject in the immediately preceding verses, 12–14, and our *v. 15* begins without any notified change of subject. Now *God the Father*, at all events, never *put on* or *put off* the “*principalities and powers.*” If, however, the Apostles have abruptly and without any notice changed the subject of his verbs and made Christ the subject without naming Him, then, if it were really necessary to adopt the sense of *stripping oneself* rather than that of *stripping another*, we should be forced to follow the Syriac version and some of the Fathers in taking our ἀπεκδυόμενος absolutely, and making the words “*principalities and powers*” dependent on the following verb, thus: “*Stripping himself* [sc. as an athlete for a contest] *he made an open shew of the principalities and powers.*” But this seems utterly incongruous and inadequate, and the order of the Greek words militates against it. We are thus finally brought to the decisive inquiry whether the *middle* voice ἀπεκδυόμενος, even without extant confirmatory examples, can be used like the Latin *exuere* in the *active* sense of *stripping another*, as well as in the reflexive sense of *stripping oneself*. Such a use is perfectly consistent with

the laws of the Greek language; and solitary instances of many words and significations abound in the extant literature. The *middle* voice of a large number of verbs is used almost interchangeably with the *active*, with modified shades of meaning (cf. the use of the med. ἤλασατο, *drove*, and not the act., in Plat. *Gorg.* 484, of the act of the hero in driving off the spoil). Illustrations may be found in such *middle* forms as ἀπογράφεισθαι, *to register oneself*, but also *to register others*; ἀπολύεισθαι, *to free oneself*, but also *to free others*; and a very exact parallel to our word, περιαιρείσθαι, *to strip off from oneself*, but also *to strip off from others*. So, then, with our ἀπεκδύεισθαι, as with the Lat. *exuere*, *to strip others* is as fully admissible a sense, on grammatical grounds, as the sense of *stripping oneself*; and, for this sense of *stripping others*, the *middle* voice may not improbably have been specially chosen by the Apostle in preference to the *active* (even if in use), for the purpose of emphasizing principal (semi-reflexive) rather than ministerial agency. At length, then, we have a clear and undeniable sense which alone accords with the subject of the main verb, whether that subject be Christ or whether it be God the Father, and which also is a fitting introduction to the exultant close of the verse. The final words indicate that to the Apostle's mind was present the pageant (often witnessed) of some notable conqueror, who, for the greater glory of his triumph, causes the vanquished princes to be *stripped* of their dignities and princely vestures, and "*puts them to open shame*" in his triumphal progress before their execution. This picture, a glorious one, he transfers in rapturous language to the triumph of Christ or the Father; and its masterly touches more and more convincingly impress us: "*Having stript* the principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly [*or boldly made them a public spectacle*], triumphing over them." The A.V. "*spoiled*" (like the Rheims "*despoiled*," following the

Vulg. *expolians*) maintains the general splendour of the picture, but misses the striking effect of the detail. For modern readers, however, unacquainted with antiquity, “spoiled” or “despoiled” may still be the more forcible. It may be desirable to add, in confirmation (if need be) of the reference of the triumph to *God the Father*, that it is to the “mighty working” of *the Father* that S. Paul elsewhere ascribes the resurrection and glorification of Christ at His right hand, thus, notwithstanding the crucifixion and death, “despoiling the powers and triumphing over them in Him,” i.e. in Christ.

I have ventured to select the above out of many examples, and dwell at some length upon them, under a deep sense of their importance, doctrinally and otherwise. On the many minor inaccuracies which, I am sorry to believe, disfigure almost every page of the R.V., I have neither space nor wish here to dwell. The A.V., it is true, also has its blemishes and imperfections, but they fade almost into insignificance in comparison with the serious errors of the Revised. The Version of James’ translation is more true to the genius of the English language, and characterized in more directions than one by more profound scholarship. Until both Text and Translation be made much more perfect, it involves much less wrong and much less loss to the churches to retain the old Version.

J. B. McCLELLAN.

CONSCIENCE AND CREED.

(1) THAT a man himself is as he thinks of God, is a truth on which stress has often been laid by the theological teacher, to whom I gratefully acknowledge my deepest debt—Principal Fairbairn. That a man thinks of God as he himself is, is its companion truth, which must not be for-