

washing, *lono*; if sprinkling, *rantizo*; if purifying, *katharizo*, &c. Why, then, use *baptizo*, unless he wished to prescribe immersion, as that was its general and usual meaning, known and acknowledged by all wherever the Greek language obtained? My opponent while he admits all this, that *baptizo* commonly meant to immerse, in Greek literature, before and at the time, and subsequently to the writing of the New Testament, told us to-day that immersion first obtained among the Greeks in the third century.

To this he made no reply, supposing that it fell from him in the excitement of debate.

Dr. Newton replied by assuming that the ordinary or usual meaning of this word was different from the primary meaning; for a primary meaning implies a secondary meaning; and if there was one instance in which *baptizo* did not mean to immerse, his opponent "would sink beneath the waves." He assumed that this word was not always used in an exclusive sense of immerse in the classics, and in proof of this he cited an instance from Dr. Gale, where he quotes Aristotle as saying: "The Phœnicians who inhabit Cadiz, relate that sailing beyond Hercules' pillars, in four days, with the wind at east, they came to a land uninhabited, whose coast was full of seaweed, and is not laid under water (*baptistheshai*) at ebb; but when the tide comes in, it is wholly covered and overwhelmed." This is clearly not a case of immersion; for to immerse is to put a "thing into the water, you cannot immerse the shore into the sea."—Wall's History, 3d vol, 121. He observed that Mr. Gale, from this example, must have admitted that there could be a case where a thing was immersed without being put into the water—the water passed over it. The use of a word is its sole and best arbiter—and cited the case given by Hippocrates speaking of a blister plaster being baptized in breast milk and Egyptian ointment, and submitted that the audience should determine what kind of operation that was. We must determine from the *usus loquendi* of the language as generally understood, to ascertain the meaning of a word. He called upon his opponent to inquire into the meaning of this word without the use of dictionaries; remarking that his opponent seemed to be fanatical, infuriated and intoxicated upon this subject, as were those who affiliated with him. Let him come to the New Testament use.

KNOWLEDGE.—Knowledge is not a couch whereupon to rest a searching and restless spirit; or a terrace for a wandering and variable mind to walk up and down with a fair prospect; or a tower of state for a proud mind to raise itself upon; or a fort or commanding ground for strife and contention; or a shop for profit or sale; but a rich storehouse for the glory of the Creator, and the relief of man's estate.—Lord Bacon.

Revision of the English New Testament.

From the Primitive Church Magazine.

Concluded.

This translation was dedicated to the king, who in 1536, ordered copies of it to be placed in churches—but Coverdale was under no control as to his procedure in translating, and he said, "I have neither wrested nor altered so much as one word for the maintenance of any manner of sect."

In 1537 all that Tyndale had translated of the Old Testament, including the books of which his translation had not before been published, and his version of the New, were printed in a Bible called "*Matthew's Bible*," the version of the books not translated by Tyndale, being taken from Coverdale's Bible.

Archbishop Cranmer, between the middle of 1535 and the middle of 1537, took measures for the preparation of a revised version of the New Testament. He sent different parts of the New Testament of a former translation, supposed to be Tyndale's, written in large paper books, "to the best learned bishops, and others," for their correction. In this he appears to have had the sanction of the king. This revision of the New Testament is supposed to be that inserted in "*the great Bible*," sometimes called Cranmer's and sometimes Whitchurch's Bible, printed by Grafton and Whitchurch by direction of Lord Cromwell, the king's viceroy in ecclesiastical matters. The greater part of the Old Testament, in the great Bible, was a revision of Matthews' Bible. It was completed in 1535. This was the first instance of royal and episcopal interference with the printing of a revised version of the English Scriptures. Whatever improvement may have been made in many parts of the translation, some of the changes made were for the worse, instead of the better. For instance, Tyndale and Coverdale translated John x. 16 "There shall be one flock and one shepherd," correctly rendering the Greek; but in the great Bible, or Cranmer's, as it is often called, the revisor, following the vulgar Latin, put "one fold and one shepherd," thus introducing "inaccurate rendering," which continued through various revisions, and is retained to this day.—(See preface to Bagster's English Hexapla, p. 84.) This royal interference was also attended by a prohibition, in Nov., 1539, forbidding any one to print an English Bible for five years, without license from Cromwell, in order that this version only might be used.

On the accession of Mary, in 1553, many godly men took refuge on the continent from persecution, and several of these, of whom Coverdale was one, commenced a new translation of the Bible into English at Geneva, whence it was called the *Geneva version*. The New Testament was finished in 1557. Mary died Nov. 17, 1558, and the Old Testament was completed during the reign of Elizabeth. This was another instance of translation without royal and episcopal authority, and displayed the advantages of this freedom in the earnestness of the translators to give as fully as possible the plain English meaning of the original Greek. The translators had an opportunity of using all the advantages afforded by the labours of the reformers on the continent; and as another reason for making this revision, they say that the knowledge of Hebrew and Greek had greatly increased since the earlier versions had been made; so that much more accuracy could be obtained than before. This version became, and continued to be the popular version in England, notwithstanding the competition of royally authorised versions, till 1611; and even was but gradually superseded by the present version.

In Elizabeth's reign the great Bible continued to be the royally authorised translation, until a revision of it was undertaken by royal and episcopal authority, which was doubtless intended to supersede the Geneva version. It was called the

bishops' Bible, probably because a majority of the translators were bishops. The different portions of the work were assigned to the different revisors by Archbishop Parker. The version was published in 1568. "As a whole, it was not nearly so good a translation as that of the Geneva exiles;" (Hex. p. 143) but it was made by James I. the basis of that which we now use.

The venerable Coverdale, though once Bishop of Exeter, ended his days in poverty, in 1569, because he could not conform to the ritual of the Protestant Church of England; and others of the translators of the Geneva version had similar objections. T. H. Horne says that they were "all zealous Calvinists, both in doctrine and discipline." Their version was thus intimately associated with the spirit of non-conformity, and on the accession of James I., a petition was presented to him by a large number of the clergy, for the correction of "divers abuses" in the Church of England, such as the non-conformists objected to. Dr. John Reynolds, on behalf of the petitioners, asked for a new translation of the Bible, hoping probably to obtain an authorised version more conforming to the Geneva version. King James's translators say that "these petitioning Puritans pleaded that they could not with good conscience subscribe to the communion book, since it maintained the Bible as it was there translated, which was, as they said a most corrupted translation." The king adopted the proposal for a revised translation, but for the directly opposite end of superseding, if possible, the Geneva Bible, which the Bishops' Bible had failed to effect, and also of obtaining a version more suited to his high church and state views, than any yet published. He said that "he had never yet seen a Bible well translated in English, though he thought the Geneva the worst, and therefore wished that some special pains should be taken in this matter, for one uniform translation," which should "be ratified by his royal authority, and so his whole church to be bound to this translation, and not to use any other."—Lewis, p. 308. This judgment was equally unjust, both as to the Geneva, and the other Protestant English versions. They were all substantially good, and the Geneva was certainly not the worst. Even King James's revisors say, in their address to the reader, that "all is sound for substance in one or other of our [previous] editions;" and the Geneva, in addition to other advantages, shared the last labours of Coverdale, who had prepared the first complete printed English Bible, and had been employed as editor in the printing of Cranmer's, or the great Bible.

The first rule given by King James to the revisors was, "the Bible ordinary read in the church, commonly called the Bishops' Bible, to receive as few alterations as may be, and to pass throughout, unless the original plainly call for an amendment." But in the last rule, it was directed that the following versions should be followed, "when they agree better with the text than the Bishops' Bible, viz., Tyndale's, Coverdale's, Matthews', Whitchurch's, and Geneva." The third and fourth rules to the observance of which the king called special attention, were "the old ecclesiastical words to be kept, as the word church not to be rendered congregation;" and "when any word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most eminent fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place, and the analogy of faith." Both these rules were at variance with the duty of the revisors, to open every window which can be opened, "to let in the light," as they say, and to own no patristic or "ecclesiastical" usage or authority as having any right to perpetuate obscure terms, or to decide which of the meanings considered orthodox, is the true. The revisors did not fully carry out the first of these rules; they did so only in certain cases, in which they preferred, for reasons which may be conjectured, the long used ecclesiastical terms. They say in their preface, "We have, on the one side, avoided scrupulosity of the Puritans, who leave the old ecclesiastical words, and betake them to others, as when they put washing for baptism and congregation instead of church; as also, on the other side, we have