

mentioned ; but Dr. Nestle adds to the Cod. Alexandrinus, as authority for the reading, about twenty other MSS. along with the Slavic, Armenian, and Georgian versions.

Dr. Nestle also writes me that in the famous *editio Sixtina* of the Septuagint of 1586-87, the Greek title reads ΗΗΑΛΛΑΙΑ ΛΙΑΟΗΚΗ ; that is, with two Η's for the Π, an inverted Λ for the Δ, and an Ο for the Θ ; using Roman type, since it "seemed too much" to cut Greek type. The same is true for the rest of the title. No biographer seems to have noted these facts.

---

Ἐὰν μὴ, Gal. ii. 16.

BY PROF. D. R. GOODWIN, D.D., LL.D.

IN rendering these particles the English revisers have substituted "save" for the "but" of the authorized version, and have relegated "but only" to the margin ; and to this change they must have adhered by a two-thirds vote against the protest of their American coadjutors.

It is here proposed to examine the propriety of this change.

Both ἔὰν μὴ and εἰ μὴ primarily mean *if not, unless, except (nisi)* ; but sometimes, when subjoined to a main proposition which has been modified by an adjunct, they indicate an exception, not to the entire proposition, but to the proposition considered aside from its adjunct, thus : "No lepers in Israel were cleansed εἰ μὴ Naaman the Syrian," where we cannot reasonably mean, "No lepers in Israel were cleansed save (or except) Naaman the Syrian" ; but the sense must be, "No lepers in Israel were cleansed,—no lepers were cleansed except Naaman the Syrian" ; or, briefly, in English, "No lepers in Israel were cleansed but Naaman the Syrian." So that, unless before these particles the main proposition is supposed to be repeated *without the adjunct*, the statement (with *save* or *except*) becomes illogical, and often amounts to an absurdity. With εἰ μὴ, it is true, these cases are more frequent than with ἔὰν μὴ, but with the latter they are not wanting. In most of these cases it is to be observed the English particle "but" gives the exact sense of the original, *without requiring* any ellipsis to be supplied ; and then to use *save* or *except* instead of *but*, cannot fail to suggest to any English reader of a logical turn of mind a painful contradiction. The English "but," it is true, is mostly adversative ; but it is remarkable that, by its etymology, it is properly exceptive (beutan, be out, let be out, or except) ; and, indeed, the

exceptive is, in itself, only *one form* of the adversative. By the interchange of the affirmative and negative after *but*, it passes from the exceptive to the general adversative sense, and leaves the meaning of the statement substantially as it was before; as, "Whence all but him had fled" (where good English requires "all but he"), — the germ being "All, or all others, had fled, but he had *not* fled"; or as, "The branch cannot bear fruit of itself, but if it abide in the vine, it *can* bear fruit"; or, again, "No lepers in Israel were cleansed, but Naaman the Syrian *was* cleansed." However, be all this as it may, there is no doubt that in many cases "but" is the best and simplest translation of the Greek particles εἰ μὴ and εὖν μὴ, and as such it has been adopted by the revisers in almost numberless instances. Εἰ μὴ, for example, they translate by *but* in Matt. v. 13; xii. 4, 24, 39; xiv. 17; xv. 24; xvi. 4; Mark ii. 7; Luke xi. 29; John iii. 13; x. 10; xiv. 6; xvii. 12 (cf. Gal. i. 19); Rom. xi. 15; xiii. 1; 1 Cor. viii. 4; x. 13; xii. 3; 2 Cor. ii. 2; Eph. iv. 9; Heb. iii. 18; 1 John ii. 22; v. 5; Rev. xix. 12, etc. They substitute *save* for *but* in Mark ii. 26 (but cf. Matt. xii. 4); ix. 29; x. 18 (but cf. Mark ii. 7 and 1 Cor. viii. 4); Acts xi. 19; Rom. xiii. 8; 1 Cor. i. 14; ii. 11; Rev. xiv. 3; and *except* for *but* at Rom. vii. 7. In all these cases, so far as the sense is concerned, "but," "save," or "except" could have been used indifferently; and the changes abound with specimens of gross inconsistencies. At 1 Cor. vii. 17 and Gal. i. 7, they have given *only* for *but*, — well enough, but quite unnecessary. At Luke iv. 26, 27, they have put *but only* for *save*. This is right; though right in their own teeth, and though their "only" is unnecessary there, as well as at Rev. ix. 4 and xxi. 27, there being no μόνος in their text. The μόνος is connected with εἰ μὴ, for "but only," in Matt. xii. 4; xxi. 14; xxiv. 36; Mark xi. 13; xiii. 32; Luke v. 21; vi. 4; Eph. iv. 15; and Acts xi. 19. Ought these cases to have been confounded with the others, and that by interpreters who are so exceeding punctilious about correspondences and divergences of text, even in the minutest particles? How inconsistent the revisers have been with themselves in making these endless changes in the rendering of εἰ μὴ will be perceived in connection with the comparisons of texts above referred to. For example, compare Mark x. 18 with ii. 7, where the very same words εἰ μὴ εἰς, ὁ Θεός, in precisely the same construction, are rendered, in the one case, "but one, *even* God," and in the other, "save one, *even* God"; while the authorized version reads *but* in both cases, — "but God only," and "but one, *that is*, God." And while, as we have seen, they have rendered εἰ μὴ by *but* in multitudes of

instances, and have rightly substituted *but only* for *save* and *saving*, at Luke iv. 26, 27, thus fully admitting that those particles may properly be rendered by *but*, what reason can be given for the perversity of having actually substituted *save that* for *but* in Rom xiv. 14, when the nature of the construction is perfectly parallel to that in St. Luke as well as to that with *ἐὰν μὴ* in the passages before us in Galatians? They make the Apostle say: "Nothing is unclean of itself, save that to him that esteemeth anything to be unclean to him it is unclean" (of itself?). If the "save that" is used in the English, the ellipsis must be supplied, thus: "Nothing is unclean of itself; nothing is unclean, save that," etc. Meantime, in English, the particle *but* gives the exact sense without further ado, just as it did in St. Luke.

It has been plausibly alleged that, in some cases, *εἰ μὴ*, like the English *but*, passes into the simply adversative sense, as at Gal. i. 19, where it is commonly admitted not to be implied that James must have been one of the Apostles, the sense being: "Other of the Apostles saw I none, but I *did* see James the Lord's brother." Still, even here, the form of the thought may be exceptive, recurring to the general idea which was prevailing in the Apostle's mind; thus, "Other of the Apostles—those who might be supposed to have influenced my teaching—saw I none; nor indeed of other persons who might be supposed thus to have influenced me, did I see any save James the Lord's brother."

So much for the analogous case of *εἰ μὴ*. *Ἐὰν μὴ* may be more strictly exceptive, and may less frequently have the phase of meaning so often presented by *εἰ μὴ*. But that it sometimes presents the same, and is properly to be rendered by *but*, cannot be doubted. The revisers themselves have fully recognized the fact, and have so rendered it; e.g., in Mark x. 30 ("but he shall receive," etc.), and in John v. 19, of which further on. At Matt. xxvi. 42: "Except I drink it," the *except* is retained. As, in this case, *but* could not be used in English without a reconstruction, we are forced back upon the implied construction of the Greek. We might indeed say: "If this cup may not pass from me, but I must drink it." And this would not be far from a strict translation, for our Lord did not mean to say: "If this cup may not pass from me, except only in the case that I drink it, and then it will pass." He meant, rather: "If it be necessary that this cup should not pass from me, but that I should drink it" (if there be no other alternative). In John xv. 4 we have another instance in which we cannot, without reconstructing, use our *but* for *ἐὰν μὴ*, the English being as impotent as the Greek: "The branch

cannot bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine." This does not mean that the only case in which the branch can bear fruit of itself is when it abides in the vine. It means, rather: "The branch cannot bear fruit of itself [this is absolute, and without exception]; the branch cannot bear fruit (at all) except it abide in the vine"; or, simply, "The branch cannot bear fruit of itself, but only if it abide in the vine" (can it bear fruit).

Meantime, by their translation of John v. 19, "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father doing," the revisers have admitted once for all that there is nothing to hinder *ἐὰν μὴ* from being translated by *but*. Let it be remembered, therefore, that it is not modern Greek scholarship that is to settle the question whether it should be rendered *but* or *save* or *except*; but that question is to be determined by the logic of the case and the exigences of English usage. But the passage in John is perfectly parallel to that here in Galatians, as regards the construction of *ἐὰν μὴ*. "The Son can do nothing of himself [this is absolute], nor can he do anything save what he seeth the Father doing," or, briefly, in simple English, "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father doing," — "that the Son doeth likewise." If we put *save* for *but*, we must either supply the ellipsis or we come to the absurd statement: "The Son can do nothing of himself save what he seeth the Father doing," — "that the Son doeth of himself," for the second clause is then made an exception out of the first proposition as it stands. This is the same sort of absurdity as actually follows from the revised translation here in Galatians. We submit, that the meaning of the Apostle is simply this (as in the A.V.): "A man is not justified by (the) works of (the) law, but through the faith of Jesus Christ," implying, as the Apostle proceeds to say, "And by that he is justified, and not by (the) works of (the) law; for by (the) works of (the) law shall no flesh be justified." Here, again, if we put *save* for *but*, we must insert the ellipsis in English, and read thus: "A man is not justified by the works of the law; nor is he justified at all, save through the faith of Jesus Christ." In both these cases (John v. 19 and Gal. ii. 16) the Vulgate has *nisi* for *ἐὰν μὴ*. But in both cases, Wicliffe, Tyndal, Cranmer, the Geneva, and even the Rhemish Version read "but" (with our A.V.); and the last cannot be supposed to have been warped by any predilection for the doctrine of justification by faith only. What led the revisers to their peculiar rendering, it is impossible to guess; but they would actually make the Apostle say: "A man is not justified by the works of the law, save through faith in Jesus

Christ,—and then he *is* justified by the works of the law,—*for* by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified”! For surely it cannot be denied, that the parenthetic inference above inserted logically follows in all such cases. For example, the Constitution of the United States provides that “The privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* shall not be suspended unless (save) when, in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it.” This certainly implies that in such cases it *may* be suspended; otherwise, its suspension is utterly forbidden.

It may possibly occur to some one that something special, bearing upon the question in hand, may grow out of the contrast of the two prepositions *ἐκ* and *διὰ*, used respectively with *ἔργων* and *πίστεως*, so that the meaning may be that “a man is not justified from, or out of, or on the *ground* of works of law, except through the medium of faith.” If this were so, it would have its special application to those who have the law; as the Jews certainly have, whatever may be the case with others; and then the meaning would be, that those without law—if there be any such—may be justified from, or out of, or on the *ground* of faith, *ἐκ πίστεως*; but those who have the law are justified from, or out of, or on the *ground* of works, *ἐκ ἔργων*, but *that only* through the *medium* of faith, *διὰ πίστεως*. To all this the answer is, that the Apostle gives just the reverse rule of discrimination at Rom. iii. 30, declaring that God shall justify the circumcision *ἐκ πίστεως*, and the uncircumcision *διὰ πίστεως*. As to the English prepositions in connection with justification, if they were confined to strict propriety of usage, we should say “justified *by* God or *by* his grace” (it is God that justifies); “justified [not] *from, out of, or on the ground of, works*”; “justified *through* or by the *instrumentality* of faith”; “justified *in* Christ, or *for* the merits of Christ, *in* his name, or *for* his name’s sake.” In Greek, *ἐκ* is sometimes connected with faith, but *διὰ* is never connected with works; nor are either faith or works ever connected with justifying as the nominative agent or as the causal dative or as a genitive with *ἀπό*.

The truth is, if *ἐάν μὴ* may ever be rendered by *but* instead of *save*, then, of all cases actual or imaginable, this in Galatians is the very case when it should, by all means, be so rendered. The logical sense of the passage itself, the argument of the immediate context, the strain of the entire epistle, the whole tone and character of St. Paul’s teaching elsewhere, combine to require it. In view of the whole history of English translations and of the revisers’ own precedents, their rendering here may certainly be called *strange*. If they were led to

it by a desire to reconcile the doctrine of St. Paul with that of St. James, we have only to say that, in the first place, this was none of their business as translators; and, in the second place, while we are perfectly clear that there is no serious difficulty in adjusting, by other and legitimate methods, the apparent differences of the two Apostles, yet, if this cannot be done without doing violence to the text and perverting the language of one or the other Apostle, then, in God's name, — as Bishop Butler says in a similar emergency, — let it be left undone.

In fine, there can be no doubt that further consideration will satisfy all parties that the American revisers are right in proposing to substitute *but* for *save* in the revised text, and to omit the "margin"; or, rather, we shall simply return to the authorized version of the whole passage; for, as to "the faith of Jesus Christ," it is as intelligible as "faith in Jesus Christ," and probably was never misunderstood. Moreover, it is a more literal rendering than the other, and it is supported by the authority of the revisers themselves, who, at Rev. xiv. 12, have rendered τὴν πίστιν Ἰησοῦ "the faith of Jesus."

---

Τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα. *Jas. i. 17.*

BY PROF. D. R. GOODWIN, D.D., LL.D.

THE common, or, perhaps we should say, the vulgar, English reader is apt to understand "shadow" here as the extreme antithesis to substance or reality, as the least possible modicum, the infinitesimal particle; but there is no evidence that ἀποσκίασμα was ever used either by the learned or by the vulgar in any such sense. That sense should, therefore, be entirely set aside.

Some have presumed the author of the epistle to be using a strictly astronomical figure, as if he had said: "With whom is no parallax, neither tropical shade." But we cannot suppose St. James to have employed these words in the sense of the modern technical astronomy. Besides, the word παράλλαξις, and not the Apostle's παραλλαγή, belongs to that technical usage. Still, it must be admitted that the ancients had no little practical astronomical knowledge, — more perhaps of this than of almost any other of what we call the physical sciences. As early as Homer's time, τροπαί was used to indicate the solstitial points, and the times of the solstices and equinoxes were carefully observed and recorded on pillars or parapetmata, and were sometimes announced from sacred caves with religious and