

EXPOSITORY NOTES.

ISAIAH 49 :3.

Ought not the term Israel in this passage to be translated as a personal term, "Prince of God?" Such a rendering will fit in with the intensely personal character of the entire paragraph, verses 1-7. The picture of the Messiah stands out with great clearness of outline in all this chapter as far as verse 13. His designation as the prince of God is eminently fitting and corresponds with the New Testament idea.

If the translation be admitted here, it opens up possibilities also for a number of other passages in this part of Isaiah.

"Let not your heart be troubled; believe in God, believe also in me."—John 14:1.

These words of Jesus, long and generally understood as *consolation in sorrow*, are far more emphatically *exhortation* and *faithful forewarning in danger*. They are not an appeal to feeling, but a command to faith. It is not a question of emotional sorrow, but of spiritual service. It is not a matter of involuntary emotion at all, but clearly a matter of responsible will. It is not a present soothing balm for immediate felt distress, but instead a strong preventive of future complete surrender of moral purpose. I do not mean that consolation may not be indirectly involved as a result. I simply mean that it is not directly expressed or contained in the language of Jesus, and that obedience is not to be looked for in the absence of sorrow and fear. The heart of the interpretation is found in the word "heart," which is from the Greek word *καρδία*. This word, *καρδία*, is not in any exclusive sense the seat of the emotional life. Does it really even include the seat of the emotional life here? At the most, it is quite doubtful. The Jews regarded *not the heart, but*

the bowels as the seat of the emotional life; hence they said, "bowels of compassion." They certainly did consider the will as located in the "heart," and also the faith and the thought as in the heart; hence the expression, "purpose of thy heart," "thinks in his heart," "believe in thy heart," and many other similar passages. One other word needs brief consideration. It is "troubled." It is from the Greek word *ταράσσω*. This word means to shake or agitate, sometimes more or less violently, as when the wind strikes suddenly and hard the peaceful waters of the Sea of Galilee and drives and lifts up those waters out of their former calm and peaceful position and repose. So, figuratively, metaphysically, most powerful winds would soon fall upon their minds, wills and purposes, and they would be in great danger of allowing them to be moved, and torn from both the Father and Himself. The arrest, the trial, the crucifixion, the burial, the awful three days of darkness and silence in the tomb were dreadful and powerful forces hurled with cyclonic violence against their wills.

It was a serious and sad thing that their feelings and fears should be so greatly excited and moved by these events, but it would be far more serious and far sadder if their moved feelings should be allowed to move their wills and moral purpose of loving obedience and faith from the Father and the Son. Hence the vital importance of these words of Jesus as a faithful forewarning against *instability of will, and most disastrous change of mind, and surrender of moral purpose*. It was quite impossible for them, being human, to prevent sorrow, distress, anxiety, perplexity and fear from finding some place in their feelings and thoughts, but it was possible for them to resist the influence of these things so far as surrendering their moral purpose of loving obedience to Jesus was concerned. Even if they *feel afraid*, they must *not be afraid*. To *feel* is not to *be*. Jesus after giving this negative command, lovingly forbidding the surren-

der of their moral and spiritual equilibrium, adds the positive command, "Believe in God, believe also in me." I think "believe" is in each case here a present imperative, and has the force and meaning of "*continue to believe and trust in the Father and in Me.*" When the direful events of the darkest night and darker days shall follow, and perplex and distress and alarm them, they must accept these dreadful events as God's *own providences*. He is still and ever the Almighty and All-wise and All-controlling Father, and Jesus is still and ever the All-obedient and All-loving Son of God; a moment later declared by Him to be identical in spiritual essence with the Father, and later demonstrating the truth of His declaration by revealing Himself in His resurrection, and still later in His glorious ascension.

The practical value of these words and the real meaning and purpose of Jesus cannot be overestimated. Do we stand in the darkness awaiting the terrible onslaught of dreadful events of cyclonic power that will perplex us, distress us, and affright us? *We must feel their force.* Shall we sustain and resist their almost overwhelming shock against our moral purpose of loving obedience to Jesus? Oh, yes! Most assuredly, *we must and shall resist the shock*, when we ask Him to help us, and recall His own words, "Let not your heart be troubled: believe in God, believe also in Me."

Χριστός and *ὁ Χριστός*.

Our popular English translations have made no distinction between the presence and the absence of the article with *Χριστός*. It is beyond question that within the New Testament period there is progress from the adjectival use of this term toward the substantive use. The word is coming to be a personal designation of the Redeemer rather than a descriptive epithet. There are also

other facts of usage to be taken into account in the use of the term, which need not here be recounted.

It is not safe ever to assume that the distinction is out of consciousness, without first examining the passage. One cannot admit that Paul at least ever uses the term without an entire fitness in his use or lack of use of the article. And the treatment of the article by him is in exact accord with the principles of classic usage. Let us illustrate with some passages from Ephesians:

In 1:10 the eternal purpose of God is declared to have contemplated summing up all things in the Messiah. The thought is, in the One contemplated and provided as the Messiah in the original plan. The reference to the historical Christ is secondary. Hence δ Χριστός. Similarly in verse 12 Paul refers to "we (Jews) who before (i.e. His coming and the Gospel) hoped in the Messiah. Cf. also 1:20, 2:5. On the other hand in 2:12 speaking of the pre-Christian condition of the heathen the Apostle says that they were without a Messiah (χ ωρίς Χριστοῦ). In the next verse the state of these heathen is presented now that "they have been made nigh in the blood of the (δ) Messiah." They were formerly without *any* Messianic hope; now they have the benefit of God's Messianic redemption.

With Jesus Paul applies Christ as adjective, placing it before, Χριστός Ἰησοῦς, 3:21, etc.; defining it by Ἰησοῦς, appositively using the article when it is functional in significance, e. g. 3:11, but without the article when merely personal, e. g. 1:2,3,5, etc. The use of the article in 3:11 is especially facile when we have before us *a* plan of *the* ages which God made in the Messiah, Jesus (personal), *the* Lord of us. Things are said of *the* Christ which cannot be said fitly of Christ (personal): e. g. in 4:13 Paul speaks of the growth of *the* Messiah's body until it attains the stature of the fullness of the Messiah. It is correct to speak of the coming to completeness

through the ages of the (functional) Messiah but not of Christ (personal).

One would suggest the propriety of rendering the anathrous *Χριστός* by Christ and where the article is used by the Messiah. In the one example cited (2:12) where it is wholly impersonal, a Messiah would best convey the idea.

Italicized Words in the Bible.

For readers of this Quarterly no statement is needed of the reason for the use of *italics* in the versions of the Scriptures. It may be permitted, however, in passing to suggest that the preacher might well occasionally remind his congregations that they represent terms supplied by translators for the sake of clearness, or of completeness of grammatical structure in English. Possibly no reader of this note will need the further suggestion that no sermon subject nor point of emphasis in a sermon can legitimately be made to depend on a word that appears in *italics* in the generally used English versions.

The present purpose is by the use of some illustrations to call attention to the fact that the preacher ought to study his Bible with the consciousness that these words are supplied by translators and have no corresponding words in the original languages. And intelligent lay readers ought to be encouraged to read in the same consciousness. To be sure it ought to be taken for granted that the enlightened preacher will get his meaning from the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures and so will be largely independent of the English version. Still there are not a few able preachers who sometimes omit the study of the text in the original language. The suggestions here will, it is hoped, have value for such as these. It must be intimated also that in the public reading of the Scriptures attention to this will not infrequently guide to effectiveness in expression.

Let it be admitted at once that many of these supplied words are such as are obviously called for in passing from languages of characteristic idioms to the English with its differing idioms. Supplying the needed words adds to the literary value and the lucidity of the English Scriptures.

But having taken so much for granted, one may be bold to affirm that in the majority of cases supplying words has proved a positive detriment in the clear understanding of the Word of God.

Attention is here directed to three ways in which this is true. Inasmuch as some of the examples cited will illustrate more than one manner of harm wrought by the *italicized* words, the three complaints are stated at once, while the illustrations follow. (1) A great many of these words are simply useless. They add nothing. They detract little. The English and the Greek (particularly) having each two or more idiomatic ways of expressing an idea the translators have used one where the Greek used the other when the two might just as well, to say the least, have been made to correspond. (2) A large number of *italicized* words introduce a didactic form of statement where the original had a dramatic, emotional, rhetorical form. This is always a distinct loss, sometimes a serious loss. This is particularly true in the poetical sections and in the non-poetical, but still dramatic, elements in the prophets. Examples might also be cited from the addresses recorded in the New Testament. The state of feeling is quite as much a factor in the revelation as the statement of fact or truth. It is at this point that these supplied words do almost constant hurt to the message of the Word. Its message is primarily a message to the emotions and to the will. Lugging in words for the sake of complete didactic syntax does violence to this emotional element. Sometimes it is entirely lost by this procedure. (3) There remain still the cases, not a few, in which the translators have abandoned their

function and have become interpreters. The simple rendering of the Hebrew or Greek sentence into a corresponding English phraseology would have left ambiguity, sometimes obscurity. So the translators for good, if not sufficient, reasons have supplied terms that take away the obscurity or solve the ambiguity. In such cases it is always open to the reader to question the interpretation imposed by the supplied words, and to reject it in favor of a better if that appears. And in one's own experience it has more frequently than otherwise seemed wise to reject the interpretation suggested in the text and to adopt another. That other and better is very often found in a marginal reading provided by the translators themselves. One can but wonder at, and lament, the excess of conservative caution that hampered the English and American revisers of the Authorized Version in such matters. The marginal readings of the American Revision are characterized by genuine scholarship and fine insight. In three cases out of four their marginal reading is to be preferred. And this judgment applies to their marginal readings generally as well as to such as relate to the subject in hand.

Of course in this third class of examples one can, usually, only offer another interpretation leaving the reader, or hearer, to decide which he will adopt. Exception ought to be made here of the examples, fairly numerous, in which the text without the supplied *italics* gives a definite sense which is seriously modified by introducing another word or other words. Then preference is decidedly in favor of the unamended text.

Let us begin with an instance in which the revisers have corrected the King James version: Ps. 19:13. We formerly read, "There is no speech nor language *where* their voice is not heard." Omitting the *where* has restored the wholly different idea of the original.

In the same Psalm, verses 12-13 have been subjected to interpolation, apparently for purely rhetorical reasons

in part, while no good reason is apparent for *his* which alters the sense. *Faults* and *sins* both seem to be wrongly supplied for "errors" in the first line. So we would read:

"Who can discern errors?

Clear thou me from hidden *errors*.

Keep back thy servant also from *errors* of presumption."

In the second line "*those that are hidden*" fits perfectly both the general sense and the specific idea of difficulty in detecting error suggested in the first line.

The heightening of the dramatic effect by omitting words in *italics* and merely pausing in the reading could be illustrated on almost every page of the Bible. One needs only to open at random and test it. For example, try it on this from Ps. 49:11f.

"Their inward thought is, *that* their houses *shall continue* forever,

And their dwelling places to all generations;

They call their lands after their own names.

But man *being* in honor abideth not:

He is like the beasts that perish."

How prosaic do the inserted words make this from Ps. 57:2:

"I will cry unto God Most High,

Unto God that performeth *all things* for me."

Similarly is the dramatic emotion crippled in Ps. 58:8 where the psalmist is following up verse 7, in which he prayed that God would let his enemies "melt away as water," and adding further comparisons. Thus:

"*Let them be* as a snail which melteth and passeth away,

Like the untimely birth of a woman, that hath not seen the sun."

The lack of literary appreciation in this example is emphasized by not inserting also, since they had begun it, *like* before "that hath seen, etc.," where the margin is

surely correct in its "*like them* that have not seen the sun," a new, separate illustration.

Read it now with only the dramatic pauses:

"Let them melt away as water that runneth apace:

When he aimeth his arrows, let them be as though they were cut off;

As a snail which melteth and passeth away;

The untimely birth of a woman; them that have not seen the sun."

Eccl. 12:13 is quite spoiled by the words there interpolated: "*This is* the end of the matter; all hath been heard: Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole *duty* of man." The first interpolation destroys the rhetorical effect, while the last so tones down the strong statement of the Preacher as to give it a different value.

In Isa. 43:12, we have an example of wholly missing the point. Jehovah has summoned a religious conference of the nations (verses 8ff.) in which the representatives of heathen religions are asked to say the best that can be said for them. If they cannot justify these poor religions, then let them listen to Jehovah's witnesses and declare: "It is truth." At verse 10, Jehovah calls upon His witnesses, chosen and prepared for that purpose. They need have no hesitation. Their ground is secure. Jehovah declares: "I have declared (my eternal word is back of you), I have saved (experience justifies you), and I have shared (demonstrated the value of my religion in a long history). Then we read, after a semicolon, "and there was no strange *god* among you." Now it would seem rather obvious to drop the semicolon and allow the assuring argument to add the declaration, "and it is no strange (new) thing among you; therefore ye are my witnesses, saith Jehovah, and I am God." The argument is complete and the conclusion affirmed.

In John 6:62, no light is shed by inserting *what*. Why not retain the order of the Greek and read: "If, then, ye

shall see the Son of man ascending where he was before?" The rhetorical question leaves the hearers to ponder how their faith and spiritual life are to be maintained when Jesus is no longer physically accessible, since they have no life in themselves.

An example of mere prosaic clumsiness is seen in Acts 3:1, where "Peter and John were going up to the temple at the hour of prayer, *being* the ninth hour."

Acts 22:28 seems to be explained as a case where the true emphasis was lost by seeking to give special emphasis in "a Roman." When the regimental colonel had declared that his Roman citizenship had cost him a great sum, Paul replies: "But I am even *a Roman* born."

In Acts 23:9, the translators have failed to indicate by *italics* that they introduced a *what* and spoiled the intensely dramatic form of a question in which a simple declarative (indicative) supposition is left wholly suspended as if the conclusion were too terrible to define, or even to think of. See the effect of omitting the *what* and closing with a rising inflection: "And if a spirit hath spoken to him or an angel!"

Quite bold are the interpreting words supplied in Rom. 5:18. One cannot but think they were supplied by a certain dogmatic consciousness which, while in harmony with the theological use made of this famous paragraph (verses 12-21) from the days of Calvin until now, is not the primary import of the words as written by Paul. But the interpretation of the full paragraph is aside from the present purpose. Note verse 18, with the words inserted: "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 unto justification of life."

Verses 17 and 19 have to be taken into account in any interpretation of verse 18. Something has to be supplied to give any completed sentence in English. Always it is best first carefully to try reading a passage without any

interpolated words. Then supply only what is needful to complete clearly what the passage seems to mean without interpolation. And unless the passage does carry some definite suggestion, when carefully studied, without supplying words, it is clear that whatever is supplied constitutes only a guess and not a version of the revelation. Now, applying this method, and noting accurately the Greek, we can give a clear, if not elegant, rendering in English thus: "So then as through one trespass *it is* unto all men to condemnation; even so through one act of righteousness *it is* unto all men to justification of life." And the meaning suggests that a complete English sentence would read: "So then as through one trespass condemnation *is brought* up to all men, even so through one act of righteousness *is* justification of life *brought* up to all men." In the light of the context, then, we ask how this condemnation and this justification reach all men since brought up to them all. In each case it will be by the law of the extension of the condemnation and of the justification. In the one case, condemnation, it is by the law of heredity. In the other case, justification, it is by the law of faith. So verse 19 cannot use the exhaustive "*all men*" of verse 18, but must, if it will preserve the rhetorical balance of statement in the two members of the comparison, adopt the expression "*the many*," which may be limited. In the first instance it is unlimited because the law of heredity is automatic and universal. In the second instance the many is limited because the law of faith is voluntary and not accepted by all.

II Cor. 5:20 is another example of missing the point of the Apostle and giving a different idea: "We are ambassadors therefore on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating by us: We beseech *you* on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled to God." Paul is here setting forth the method of God for reconciling the world unto Himself in Christ (verse 19). Redeemed men, especially ministers, take Christ's place in the ministry of reconcil-

iation. God, who spoke in Christ, continues to speak in us, who are in Christ's place. Beseech is intransitive in this place, or one may say general. The *you*, Corinthians, to whom Paul addresses his letter, are already reconciled to God. In 6:1, they are entreated not to receive the grace of God in vain, as they would, did they not accept it in stewardship for others and so represent Christ. In our Gospel we entreat men generally and specifically "be ye reconciled to God." The *you* has no place here.

The last clause in Eph. 5:33 presents a very interesting study, and one where certainty is not possible. We read: "And *let* the wife *see* that she fear her husband." The Greek is: ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα.

The *ἵνα* clause with subjunctive is properly a purpose clause. The translators make it a "non-final" definitive clause, and have to supply the hortatory *let*. The words come at the end of the exhortation to wives and husbands. The duty of wives is outlined in verses 22-24. Then the ideal for husbands occupies the rest of the chapter, unless we suppose that at verse 32 there is a resumé of the ideals of both. If this last suggestion is correct, then the translators are probably right, but the Greek would be quite unusual, for this meaning is usually to be expressed with the indicative.

If, on the other hand, the message to husbands continues right on to verse 33, we would then have a regular purpose clause, assigning as one objective for the loyal and faithful love of the husband "that the wife may reverence her husband." This is a quite intelligible and appropriate sense and corresponds to the rhetorical order of the next two paragraphs concerning the mutual relations in the home.

There is the difficulty of the position of ἡ γυνὴ before the *ἵνα* which would be rare in a purpose clause. The emphasis thus lent might justify the order. On the whole

we prefer thus to regard it as a purpose clause, and so to interpolate no words.

These examples will be sufficient to illustrate an important item to be considered in reading the English Scriptures. Its exemplification will meet the careful reader on every page of the Bible.