

(*Elliot Stock*. Crown 8vo, pp. viii + 126.) Out of the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer are made fifty-two simple lessons for Sunday-school teachers, one lesson for every Sunday of the year, and then four more for the Holy Days. There are also Notes on the Lessons, and rules for the management of a Sunday school. In short, it is the Sunday-school teacher's 'Inquire Within upon Everything' necessary for a year's work, and as practical as unpretentious.

PLAIN TALKS ON PLAIN SUBJECTS. By FRED A. REES. (*Elliot Stock*. Crown 8vo, pp. vii + 146.) They took the place of the sermon in Mr. Rees' case. They had best, perhaps, take their place in the sermon. Their plainness of speech, their humanity, their apposite illustration will serve for windows to let in the light.

POINTS AND ILLUSTRATIONS. BY THE REV. JOHN MITCHELL. (*Stoneman*. Crown 8vo, pp. viii + 182.) Some are old and some are new, some are doubtful and some are true, and that is all that can be said of any volume of the kind. The arrangement is by subject; but there is a useful index of texts illustrated. In a new edition Mr. Mitchell must correct some misprints, especially that ugly one on p. 93, where the 'hills o' Fife'

are twice called the 'hills o' life,' and all sense driven out of the anecdote.

DRIVEN BY THE SPIRIT. BY THE REV. F. DOUGLAS ROBINSON, M.A. (*Taylor*. Fcap. 8vo, pp. viii + 204.) It is a Manual for Lent. Its sole intention is to deepen the sense of sin. And that intention is accomplished. It is sure to be accomplished in all who in an honest and good heart read it prayerfully. The means employed are clear statement of duty in utmost minuteness of detail, driven home by ever-recurring anecdotes.

A CHILD'S HISTORY OF SCOTLAND. BY MRS. OLIPHANT. (*Fisher Unwin*. Fcap. 8vo, pp. 233. 3s. 6d.) To write a history of Scotland which children will read for pleasure, you must give the incidents in detail. The scenes must have colour, the men and women must be men and women of flesh and blood, not dry bones. Well, Mrs. Oliphant knows that, and has done it. And Mr Fisher Unwin has published the work most attractively. But one thing has yet to be done, it must be divided into two volumes, and printed far more openly. Less than this will not do, we quite agree; but less than this in one volume is absolutely imperative. When that is done, the work is altogether charming and successful.

The Doctrinal Significance of the Revised Version.

BY THE REV. GEORGE MILLIGAN, B.D., CAPUTH.

FIRST PAPER.

IN the interesting series of letters as to the value of the Revised Version, which recently appeared in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, while ample testimony was borne to the greater accuracy and clearness of the new version, and its consequent practical advantages, little or nothing was said of its doctrinal significance. It is not uncommon, indeed, to hear it stated that the R.V. has no direct bearing upon doctrine, and that, whatever other changes it may effect, it will at least leave the great articles of the Christian faith exactly where it found them. In a sense, no doubt, this statement is true. Though the witness of particular texts may be altered, or even disappear as in the case of the famous proof-text for the Trinity (1 John v. 7), the general balance

of doctrinal truth remains unchanged. No essential article of our creed is lost. But this is not to say that no new light is cast upon any of these articles, or that a more intimate acquaintance with the exact form in which the truths of Revelation were first announced may not lead to a considerable modification in much of our popular theology. It is impossible in one or two short papers to prove this so fully as one would like. The utmost that can be attempted is to indicate a few of the passages in which the changes made by the Revisers, whether caused by an improved text or a more exact translation of the original, appear to have a bearing upon doctrinal truth.

Thus, to begin with the doctrine of our Lord's

person, when we turn to the much-disputed passage, 1 Tim. iii. 16, it is to find that the Revisers pronounce in favour of the reading $\theta\varsigma$ for $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, and in consequence translate, 'Great is the mystery of godliness; He who was manifested in the flesh.' We seem at first sight thus only to have loss. The passage in this form can no longer be quoted as a direct testimony to the Godhead of Christ, though indirectly it surely implies this in no uncertain way. Only of one who Himself existed before, who was, could it be said that He was 'manifested in the flesh'? But after all we are not dependent upon this text for the proof of Christ's divinity, and any supposed loss in this direction is more than made up by the new and striking witness which we now gain to the Personality of our religion. For it is not, as we would naturally expect, a neuter relative which follows the Greek $\mu\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$, but a masculine $\theta\varsigma$. 'The mystery—who.' The mystery is not a thing, not a truth, but a person—'He who was manifested in the flesh.'¹ Or as the same truth is expressed in the amended version of Col. ii. 2, 'The mystery of God, *even* Christ.'² While to the description which follows, 'In whom are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden,' we can add the words of ch. i. 19, 'For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in Him should all the fulness dwell.' The Son of God's love (ver. 13),³ in (not 'by') whom all things were created (ver. 16), and unto (not 'for') whom, as to their goal, all things tend, is Himself distinguished not merely by 'all fulness,' but by 'all the fulness,' the Pleroma that is, the sum of all the divine attributes and powers.

Other passages which, in their revised form, bear more or less distinctly on the divinity of our Lord are John v. 18, where the translation of the emphatic $\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\omicron\nu$ brings out the full claim which the Jews understood Jesus to make, 'But also called God His own Father'; Acts xvi. 7, where the striking reading 'the Spirit of Jesus' (not simply, as in A.V., 'the Spirit') implies that the Holy Spirit had

so taken possession of the person of the exalted Jesus that He could be spoken of as 'the Spirit of Jesus'; 2 Cor. iv. 5, where the sum of apostolic teaching is declared to be the preaching of 'Christ Jesus as Lord,' 'Lord' in the Epistles being apparently always used with reference to the risen and glorified Redeemer; Tit. ii. 13, where a slight change in the translation and improved punctuation show 'our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ' to be not two persons, but one (cf. 2 Pet. i. 1); and finally, 1 Pet. iii. 15, 'Sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord,'—a verse which Bishop Alexander quotes as, perhaps more than any other single verse, assuring him of the divinity of Jesus, and 'whose restoration to its rightful force outweighs,' he admits, 'nearly all that can be said against the Revised Version.'⁴

To these may be added the remarkable marginal rendering, 'God only begotten,' instead of 'the only begotten Son,' in John i. 18; and John viii. 58, 'Before Abraham was, I am,' where again the marginal note makes clear that different words are used in the original to describe the being of Abraham and of Christ. 'Before Abraham was born,' came into being from a previous non-existent state, 'I am,' I necessarily and eternally am. While, as examples of slight but significant changes, may be mentioned the rendering 'offered' for 'presented' in Matt. ii. 11, bringing the verse into harmony with the numerous passages in the LXX and the New Testament where the same Greek word ($\pi\rho\sigma\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota\nu$) is used of religious offerings in worship to God; and the substitution in italics of '*the Lord*' for '*God*' in Acts vii. 59.

With reference to the other side of our Lord's person, His human nature, it must be sufficient to point to Phil. ii. 5-8, with the accompanying marginal notes, which here, as throughout the R.V., are of the utmost value in bringing the exact force of the Greek before the English reader. Starting with the thought of Christ's divinity, the apostle proceeds to tell us how He who was thus originally in the form of God counted not this equality of being with God 'a prize,' a thing to be grasped at or retained, as compared with what by sacrifice He might effect for our sakes; 'but emptied Himself,' this one act in itself involving (not followed by, as the A.V. would suggest) the two great steps, 'taking the form of a servant,' and 'being made in the likeness of men'; while these, in turn, led to the

¹ See a striking sermon by Dean Vaughan in *Authorized or Revised*, pp. 3 sq.

² It should be noted that the reading in this verse is very uncertain.

³ How much more expressive than 'His dear Son'! As St. Augustine expands the thought: 'Filius caritatis ejus nullus est alius, quam qui de substantiâ ejus est genitus' (De Trin. xv. 19, quoted by Trench, *On the Authorized Version of the New Testament*, 2nd ed. p. 81, who, however, questions the inference).

⁴ *The Divinity of our Lord*, p. 66 ('Helps to Belief' series).

lowest step of all, 'the death of the cross.' How clearly, as we note the changes, and more particularly that one bold expression, 'emptied Himself,' so different from the paraphrastic 'made Himself of no reputation,' is the tremendous reality of our Lord's humiliation brought home to us! While in the verses that follow what new dignity is added to the exaltation by 'the (not 'a') name which is above every name,' which God gives to Jesus, 'in' (not 'at') which 'every knee should bow.'

When we pass from the person to the work of Christ, the doctrinal consequences attending certain improved renderings are even more significant than those we have already noticed. Thus it is the constant practice of Scripture, and more particularly of the Pauline Epistles, to regard the change wrought in the believer in an ideal light. The change, that is, from death to life, though practically only gradually realised, is presented as ideally complete, 'summed up in one definite act of the past; potentially to all men in our Lord's Passion and Resurrection, actually to each individual man when he accepts Christ, is baptized into Christ.'¹ In the A.V. this is frequently lost sight of from the English present or perfect tense being used as a rendering for the Greek aorist, whereas the R.V. observes the distinction. For instance, in Rom. vi. 2, 'We are dead to sin,' that implying a present and continuing state, becomes 'We who died to sin,' a definite past act, which has for its consequence, 'How shall we any longer live therein?' Other examples are Rom. vi. 6, 'Our old man was (not 'is') crucified with *Him*'; 2 Cor. v. 14, 'One died for all, therefore all died,' died in *Him*, sharing in the benefits of His death, a very different thing from 'then were all dead,' which suggests rather the reason for Christ's dying; Gal. iii. 27, 'As many of you as were (not 'have been') baptized into Christ, did (not 'have') put on Christ'; and Eph. ii. 5, 6, God 'quickened us

¹ Bishop Lightfoot, *On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament*, 1st ed. p. 85.

together with Christ (by grace have ye been saved), and raised us up with Him,' where the two aorists 'quickened' and 'raised' are now placed in their proper contrast with the continuous work of grace which is required in a man's salvation.²

So, too, our Lord's use of the aorist in His great intercessory prayer, 'Even as Thou gavest . . . Him whom Thou didst send . . . I glorified Thee.' . . . (John xvii. 2, 3, 4), and so on throughout the whole chapter, ought not to pass unremarked, as proving that at the moment the Saviour has passed in thought beyond His death and sufferings, and in virtue of His finished work intercedes for His people.

The *extent* of Christ's redeeming work, as including potentially all mankind, to mention another point, gains also new witness from the R.V., and that from a passage which in the A.V. seems to point the other way. Read Rom. v. 15-19 as in our ordinary Bibles, and the benefits of one man's obedience would appear to be confined to 'many'; but give the definite articles before 'one' and 'many' their proper force, as in the R.V., and then it will be seen that '*the many*, in an antithesis to *the one*, are equivalent to *πάντες*, *all*, in ver. 12, and comprehend the whole multitude, the entire species of mankind, exclusive only of *the one*.'³ The reason why the term 'the many' is used being, as Godet has well pointed out, in order to establish this contrast with the one. '*All* would be opposed to *some*, and not to *one*.'⁴ 'So then as through one trespass *the judgment came* unto all men to condemnation; even so through one act of righteousness *the free gift came* unto all men to justification of life' (ver. 18).

² Cf. also Gal. ii. 19, v. 13 (in v. 24 the Revisers have strangely retained the perfect rendering); Eph. i. 11, iv. 1, 4, 30; Col. i. 13, iii. 15; 2 Tim. i. 9; Rev. v. 9, 10. For the aorist in reference to God's eternal purposes, see 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 13.

³ Bentley, *Works*, iii. p. 244 (ed. Dyce). The passage will be found in Lightfoot, *ut supra*, pp. 97, 98, or more fully in Trench, *ut supra*, pp. 135, 136.

⁴ Comment on Rom. v. 15.