

why? Besides, there are some who think that proper allowance has not been made in the revision of 1881 for the difference between the Hellenistic Greek of the New Testament and classical Greek; and that the rendering of the Greek aorist as an English preterite, or an indefinite past tense, is not an improvement on King James's version. Dr. Edward Robinson, an eminent New Testament lexicographer, says: "The language of the New Testament is the later Greek language as spoken by foreigners of the Hebrew stock. . . . The single statement of this fact suggests at once what the character of this idiom must be. . . . The New Testament was written by Hebrews, aiming to express Hebrew thoughts, conceptions, feelings in the Greek tongue. Their idiom consequently, in soul and spirit, is Hebrew." \* But the authors of the revision of 1881 have undertaken in many places to make both the aorist and imperfect Greek tenses correspond in meaning to the same tenses in classical Greek; whereas the rendering should have conformed, according to the dictum of Dr. Robinson, to the perfect and imperfect tenses in Hebrew; but even apart from the consideration of the Hebrew coloring of the New Testament Greek, it may be fairly questioned whether anything is gained by the continual rendering of the Greek aorist by the English preterite where the former occurs in immediate connection with the perfect; for even in Attic Greek, the aorist in its widest sense, as every Greek scholar knows, includes all the indefinite and complete tenses; and when used in connection with the Greek perfect and pluperfect should ordinarily be rendered into English by the auxiliaries *have* or *had*.† Are such changes as are specified in the preceding paragraph with respect to the literalisms and Grecisms of the revision of 1881 essential changes?

There is general concurrence of opinion, likewise, that nothing should be read into any passage of Scripture that is of the nature of an exposition. The work of translators is translation, not exegesis; but how is it with respect to Acts xxvi. 28? We transcribe, in the first place, the revisers' Greek text: *Ὁ δὲ Ἀγρίππας πρὸς τὸν Παῦλον, Ἐν ὀλίγω με πείθεις Χριστιανὸν ποῆσαι*. And then we give the revisers' translation: "With but little persuasion thou wouldest fain make me a Christian." Every Greek scholar knows, of course, that for "*almost*," of the so-called Authorized Version, must be substituted the phrase "*with little*," or the phrase "*in a little time*." But why should the word "*fain*" be read into any version? and where are the vouchers for translating the active verb *πείθεις*—"thou persuadest"—as if it were *πείθῃ*, mid-voice—"thou persuadest thyself, or believest." The revisers translate, virtually, *πείθεις* with *σεαυτὸν* implic. But *πείθεις* in the sense given should have *σεαυτὸν* expressed in the text.‡ Moreover, the re-

\* Vide Pref. to N. T. Lex., pp. v. and vii.

† Vide Hadley's Gk. Gr., 706; Crosby's do., §§ 556, 589.

‡ Vide *ἐμαυτὸν πείθω* Plato's Gorgias, edited by Pres. J. D. Woolsey, p. 10, *ad fin.*; or Platonis Dialogi, p. 160, Harper's Greek and Latin Texts.